



Virginia Commonwealth University
VCU Scholars Compass

Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2015

Forbearance Across Culture

Yin Lin

Virginia Commonwealth University, liny5@vcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

© The Author

Downloaded from

<http://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/3918>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.

FORBEARANCE ACROSS CULTURE

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University

By: YIN LIN

M.S., Virginia Commonwealth University, 2013

M. A., University of Delaware, 2010

B. Law, Nanjing University, China, 2007

Director: Everett L. Worthington, Jr., Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
April, 2015

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I offer my sincerest gratitude to my academic advisor, Dr. Everett Worthington, who has supported me throughout my dissertation with his patience, forgiveness and knowledge. Without him, this dissertation would not have been started or completed. Even more than that, he sets up a model for me, probably for all his students, being an enthusiastic researcher, supportive mentor, loving husband, cooperative colleague and dedicated Christian.

Great gratitude is also due to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Eric Benotsch, Dr. Geraldine Lotze, Dr. Jean Corcoran and Dr. Robert Andrews. Without their knowledge and assistance, this study would not have been successful.

I wish to express my deepest love and gratitude to my husband Haifeng and my son Allen for their understanding and endless love. Haifeng chose to give up fun activities when we met during the weekend because I needed to focus on my dissertation. Allen spent much time playing with his nanny and toys. Without their sacrificial love, I would seriously struggle between study and family.

I am blessed with having my beloved parents and parents-in-law for supporting me, physically and emotionally, throughout my pregnancy, childbirth and postpartum. Both of my parents and parents-in-law flew to the U.S and took up most of our housework. Especially when I went back to school one month after giving birth, my parents-in-law came to stay with me in Richmond, taking care of the little baby when I could study for full time. I owe a huge thank you to my big family!

Last but not the least, I worship the omnipresent God, for showing me how weak I am in front of the difficulties, for answering my prayers for giving me the strength to hold on, and for granting me forgiveness when I disobeyed his teaching. I know, without you, Lord, I have nothing.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vi
Introduction	1
Review of the Literature	2
Method of the Review	2
My Definition of Forbearance	2
Differences Between My Definition with Other Definitions of Forbearance and Emotional Suppression	10
Forbearance and Collectivistic Coping	13
Measure of Forbearance	14
Overarching Theoretical Framework: The New Big Five Personality Processes .	16
Application of the New Big Five Personality Processes to My Conceptualization of Forbearance.....	17
Summary	24
Cultural Models of Self and Relating.....	25
Summary	27
Discussion.....	27
Research Agenda	33
Statement of the Problem for the Three Studies.....	35
Study 1: Exploratory Factor Analyses	37
Method	37
Results and Discussion	38
Study 2: Cross-Validation of Factor Structure and Construct Validity.....	40
Method for Study 2A	40
Results for Study 2A	41
Statement of the Problem for Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)	41
Method for Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)	46
Measures for Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity).....	47
Results of Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)	50
Discussion for Study 2	53
Study 3: Cross-Validation of Factor Structure in an International Sample	53

Method	54
Results	56
Discussion	57
General Discussion	57
Limitations	62
Implications for Research and Theory	63
Implications for Practice	64
List of References	66
Appendix	71
A Measures	71
Vita	80

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1.	Reviewed Articles	4
Table 2.	Items, Factor Loadings, Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Communalities for Forbearance Scale-5 (Study1)	38
Table 3.	Intercorrelations of Forbearance Scale-5, Emotion Regulation Questionnaire, Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire-Negative Expressivity Subscale, Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure-Forbearance Subscale, Self-Constructual Scale, Big-Five Inventory of personality-Agreeableness and Neuroticism, Group Harmony Forbearance Index, and Tendency to Show or Express Negative Feelings (Study 2)	52
Table 4.	Normative Data for Two University USA Samples (N=921) and One Sample of International Adults (N=39)	59

Abstract

FORBEARANCE ACROSS CULTURE

By Yin Lin, M.S., M.A.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2015.

Major Director: Everett L. Worthington, Jr., Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Psychology

Forbearance is defined for the purpose of the present dissertation as, “**the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., emotional expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony.**” I reviewed the literature on forbearance and cross-cultural studies in suppression of emotion or emotional expression under the framework of New Big Five personality processes and cultural models of self and relating. Then I offered three propositions about forbearance. Furthermore, I collected three samples and described four studies to develop and test the construct validity of Forbearance Scale as well as the Group-Harmony Forbearance Index. Last but not least, I discussed implications for future research and practice related to forbearance.

Forbearance Across Culture

Forgiveness has been enthusiastically investigated since the formation of a field roughly considered to be forgiveness studies. Worthington (1998) has argued that Smedes (1984) began the field with publication of a book that characterized the major motive for forgiving as self-enhancement and avoidance of the negative effects of grudge-holding or revenge. While the empirical study of forgiveness has proceeded quickly and has yielded a variety of review and meta-analytic papers (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; Fehr, Gelfand, & Nag, 2010; McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2000; Worthington, 2005, 2006), there are many other ways that people might deal with transgressions (Worthington, 2006). One of those ways is to forbear. This is particularly important for cultures that are generally collectivistic. *Forbearance* is defined for the purpose of the present dissertation as, **“the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., emotional expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony.”**

In Chapter 2, I reviewed the literature on forbearance and cross-cultural studies in suppression of emotion or emotional expression under the framework of New Big Five personality processes and cultural models of self and relating. Then I offered three propositions about forbearance.

In Chapters 4, 5 and 6, I presented the results of empirical research to investigate this important construct. I collected three samples and described studies to develop and test the construct validity of Forbearance Scale as well as the Group-Harmony Forbearance Index.

In Chapter 7, I discussed the results of my findings of the empirical studies in light of the model I presented in Chapter 2 and the prior empirical literatures. In addition, I discussed the

limitations of my dissertation research, and presented implications for future research and practice.

Review of the Literature

In the present review of empirical literature, I survey studies of forbearance, as well as suppression of emotion/emotion expression and culture. I outline my method of obtaining research studies, define the main theoretical construct, compare and contrast some similar constructs with forbearance, provide two models of understanding forbearance, and discuss with the reviewed research studies. Then, I propose a research agenda for future study.

Method of the Review

I reviewed research journal articles about forbearance as well as studies related to emotion suppression and culture. On April 12, 2013, I searched *PsycINFO* (Psychological Abstracts) with “forbearance” and “forbear*” as keywords. I found only nine articles that investigated forbearance. On April 13, 2013, I searched *PsycINFO* with crossed terms of “emotion suppression and culture” as keywords. I found another five articles. Thus, I found a total of 14 articles that addressed either forbearance or the relationship for emotion suppression and culture. Those articles were the corpus of articles I reviewed (see Table 1).

My Definition of Forbearance

Few researchers studied forbearance and even fewer studies used the term “forbearance” directly in the western world. Based on my conceptualization, *forbearance* is defined as the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., emotional expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or

offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony. Thus, forbearance might be measured as a behavior—such as distraction, or response substitution, or

Table 1.

Reviewed Articles

study	participants	design/methods	measures	general findings
Matsumoto et al. (2008)	3018 university students from 23 countries on 5 continents	correlation/self-report questionnaires	1) suppression subscale of ERQ 2) Hofstede Dimensions 3) long-versus short term orientation 4) positive adjustment and maladjustment	Suppression had a positive correlation with many collectivistic values (power distance, embeddedness, etc) while having a negative correlation with individualism
Wei et al. (2012)	188 Chinese international students	Self-report questionnaires	1) forbearance subscale of the Collectivistic Coping Style Measure (CCSM); 2) Heritage subscale of Vancouver Index of Acculturation; 3) Hopkins Symptoms Checklist-21 items	forbearance coping had a positive correlation with psychological distress only for those with weaker identification with their heritage culture when their acculturative stress was higher. But there was no association between forbearance coping and psychological distress when their acculturative stress was lower. No matter whether acculturative stress was high or low, there was no association between forbearance coping and psychological distress for those students with a strong home culture identification.
Haga et al. (2009)	489 psychology students from Norway, Australia and the U.S.	correlation/self-report questionnaires	1) ERQ (2003) 2) Personality (big 5, etc) 3) Well-being (depression, satisfaction with life, etc)	The effect size of the cultural difference on expressive suppression was moderate. (American scores on suppression were higher than Norwegians and Australians)

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Butler et al. (2007)	Study 1) 166 American women with either only European or bi-cultural (Asian and European) background Study 2) 120 American women with either only European or bi-cultural (Asian and European) background	STUDY 1) correlation/self-report STUDY 2) experimental/random assignment of scenarios	part 1: 1)cultural background 2)cultural values for Asian and European Americans (interdependence Vs independence, etc) 3) ERQ PART 2) 1)cultural background and values 2) state version of ERQ and rate of emotional expression and responsiveness in the videotapes 3)partners perceptions	Part 1: participants with primary European values scored lower in habitual suppression than their counterparts with bicultural European-Asian values. compared with participants with bicultural values, participants with European values reported more self-protective goals and higher level of negative emotion associated with suppression Part 2: culture values served as a moderator for the relationship of suppression and negative outcomes: suppressors with primary European values were perceived as more hostile and withdrawn than their counterparts with bicultural values. The same happened to their partners' responsiveness.
Soto et al. (2011)	71 European American college students in the U.S and 100 Hong Kong Chinese college students	Moderation model/self-report	1) ERQ (2003) 2) SWLS 3) center for epidemiologic studies depression scale	Culture was found to be the moderator for the relationship of expressive suppression and psychological functioning. For HKC, the habitual use of suppression was not associated with negative psychological functioning while for EAC, expressive suppression was positive correlated with adverse psychological health.

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

English & John (2012)	157 university students in the U.S. and 114 undergraduates in mainland of China	mediation model/self-report	ERQ (2003) 2)relationship satisfaction 3) BEQ 4) subjective Authenticity 5) SWLS	Chinese participants scored higher than American ones in habitual use of suppression;For both groups of participants, authenticity served as a mediator for the relationship of suppression and relationship satisfaction. Students were wasked ot think of a problem they had in the last 2-3 months and asked to report the extent to which they used each coping strategy on a 5 point likert scale in the CCSM.(final scale consisted of 9 items. 5 addressing social support seeking and 4 addressing forbearance)
Moore & Constantine (2005)	204 African, Asian, and Latin international students (ages 18-35)	self-report	CCSM (Collective Coping Style Measure) uses two factors, forbearance and seeking social support, Demographic questionnaire,Self Contrual Scale,Multidimensional Scale of perceived Social Support, Interpersonal Relationship Harmony Index, The Coping Strategies Inventory,Attitudes Torward Seeking Professional Psychological Help Scale	1. Forbearance and Seeking Social Support items of CCSM were positively related, but only the forbearance part of the scale was negatively related to independent self construal; 2. Found adequate test re-test reliability for both subscales (forbearance and seeking social support) of the CCSM. 3. Differences in seeking social support and forbearance were found with regards to sex. Women more frequently reported using seeking social support, while men reported more forbearance. 4. With regards to country of origin differences, students from Asia reported significantly more forbearance.

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Chiang (2012)	24 college students in Taiwan	qualitative study (interview and mood log)	Interview questions include recalling a transgression happened within a year, talking about the emotional responses to the transgression and how they adjust their emotion and reflecting how they think of their coping strategies. In terms of mood logs, students in a class were instructed to log their emotion with details when an interpersonal conflict occurs during a four-month semester.	The main reasons for college students in Taiwan to forbear experiencing or expressing their negative emotion include maintaining group harmony, replacing impulse with rationality, avoiding the embarrassment at the moment, preventing the negative consequences, obeying the traditional value/morals/ethics, finding unhelpful to express feelings and having no idea as to how to express feelings appropriately.
Lang, Shi, and Li (2009)	1000 Undergraduate students from 4 universities in China	correlation/self-report questionnaires	1) Eyesneck Personality Questionnaire Short Scale 2) Positive Affect and Negative Affect -Expanded Form	The effect size of the cultural difference on expressive suppression was moderate.
Mesquita and Albert (2006)	N/A	chapter	N/A	They employed cultural models of self and relating to describe how emotion regulation is enmeshed into the meanings and practices of a culture. Specifically, they discussed three ways that culture might regulate emotions: (a) situation selection, (b) situation modification and attentional deployment, and (c) appraisal regulations.

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Trommsdorff & Heikamp (2013)	N/A	chapter	N/A	Emotion regulation strategies are learned through the process of socialization. Children learn these strategies from their parents, and culture, thus, emotion regulation is culturally dependent in many ways. The primary goal of socialization for emotion regulation is development of culture-specific emotional regulation. If the child is successful in attaining this goal, they have obtained cultural emotional competence.
Butler (2013)	N/A	chapter	N/A	Emotion regulation occurs at different sociocultural contexts, so flexible use of emotion regulation strategies is important for well-being. The link between emotion regulation and well being is also modified by culture.
Arens (2013)	N/A	chapter	N/A	The benefit of using a particular emotion regulation strategy depends on the fit to the environment. People in collectivistic culture might choose suppression when there is a long term benefit, but may change when there is not. Therefore, the consequences of suppression are not related to culture exactly, but to a flexible use of this strategy.

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Wang and Dai (2011)	N/A	Theoretical model	N/A	They proposed forbearance as a meta-value in Chinese society. In daily life, forbearance is shown when a person has to do something against his will or has to stop doing something that he or she desires to do. They established a stereotyping model based on the Chinese forbearance ethos with a classic work of the Yuan Dynasty in China. Wang and Dai derived 10 dyads of parameters (self and others) that are interconnected to form a hierarchy for a person's forbearance development.
------------------------	-----	-------------------	-----	--

adopting a neutral facial expression—but it more often will be detectable by self-report. Self-report is crucial because if one successfully suppresses negative behavior or signs of negative emotion, the result of not showing something is not obvious. Namely, an observer would not know whether a person simply did not react to the hurt or offense because the person was not bothered, or whether the person was bothered (on a scale from little to lots) and successfully suppressed expression. Thus, the *sine qua non* of forbearance is self-report that one has tried (more or less successfully) to suppress negative motives and emotions.

We might hypothesize that in many cultures, the concern for the good of the group or collective, even at the expense of emotional suffering of the individual, might provide a rationale for forbearance (Hook, Worthington, & Utsey, 2010; Hook, Worthington, Utsey, Davis, & Burnette, 2012). That might also occur in tandem with a group norm that inhibits expression of negative emotions and behaviors.

Differences Between My Definition and Other Definitions of Forbearance and Emotional Suppression

My definition of forbearance differs from definitions used in other studies of forbearance (McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang, 2003) and suppression (McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick, & Johnson, 2001). McCullough et al. (2003) construed *forbearance* as the amount of backwards extrapolation (to the time of hurt or offense) using a straight line defined by at least two points of measurement after the date of a transgression. This definition was, I believe, problematic. Psychologically, people seem to experience an effort at forbearing. Yet, McCullough, Fincham, and Tsang do not assume any sense of trying to forbear. Clearly, some people attempt to suppress emotional expression and others seek emotional catharsis, yet simple mathematical

backwards extrapolation does not account for people's individual differences. In fact, McCullough et al.'s definition would be just as correct if people were actively seeking revenge. (A backward extrapolation to the time of the offense is always possible.)

Gross and Levenson (1993) studied emotional suppression, a form of emotion regulation defined as the "conscious inhibition of emotional expressive behavior while emotionally aroused" (pp. 970.) The definition of emotional suppression (Gottman & Levenson, 1988; Gross, 2002; Gross & John, 2003; John & Gross, 2004; Levenson & Gottman, 1985) is close to my definition of forbearance. However, I believe that forbearance is a better term to describe the suppression of emotional *expression* while emotional suppression focuses on suppressing the experience of emotion itself. Thus, I will make a differentiation between the two terms. McCullough, Bellah, Kilpatrick, and Johnson (2001) investigated, in a US student population, emotional suppression and its effects on well-being and negative affectivity. As expected, within the US population, attempts at emotional suppression had negative emotional and motivational costs. Higher suppression was related to higher negative affect, more rumination, more vengeful motives, and overall less life satisfaction. Gross and his group have conducted much research on emotional suppression in US samples. They have found that emotional suppression was associated with negative social consequences, such as avoidant attachment, lower social support, lower peer-rated desirability and less relationship closeness as well as poor marital interaction (Gottman & Levenson, 1988; Gross, 2002; Gross & John, 2003; John & Gross, 2004; Levenson & Gottman, 1985).

Because the participants' cultural backgrounds were ignored in most research above, Butler et al. (2007) studied emotional suppression and culture, investigating whether the social consequences of emotional suppression is culture-specific. Based on previous research in

individualism and collectivism, Butler et al. (2007) proposed that Asian values (e.g., interdependence and group harmony) might highly regard emotional suppression due to the preservation of relationship harmony. Thus emotional suppression might be associated with positive social outcomes in a largely collectivistic society. In their study, $N = 166$ US women with either an only-European or bi-cultural (Asian and European) background completed questionnaires, including an emotion regulation questionnaire and measures of interdependence and independence. Participants with primary European values scored lower in habitual suppression than did their counterparts with bicultural European-Asian values. Compared with bi-cultural participants, participants with European values reported more self-protective goals and higher levels of negative emotion associated with suppression. U.S Women ($n = 120$) from Study 1 also participated in Study 2, which involved an experimental design. All participants watched an emotion-arousing movie and then were randomly assigned to either suppression dyads or control dyads for a conversation following movie-watching. In a suppression dyad, a randomly assigned participant was instructed privately not to show any emotion to his or her partner in the conversation. In a control dyad, both participants were instructed to interact normally in the conversation. After the discussion, each participant was required to rate their perceptions of their partner, e.g., cold, aggressive, nervous, or withdrawn. Butler et al. (2007) found that culture served as a moderator for the relationship of suppression and negative perceptions by others. For instance, suppressors with primary European values were perceived as more hostile and withdrawn than their counterparts with bi-cultural values.

To critique the study, let me note that Butler et al. (2007) called their condition emotional suppression. However, I have made a distinction between forbearance (which is the suppression of emotional *expression*) and emotional suppression (which is the suppression of the *emotional*

experience itself). Butler et al. (2007) seemed to be instructing their participants not to express emotion, rather than not to feel it.

Despite Butler et al.'s efforts, emotional suppression is still generally seen (at least in the general public's mind within western societies) as the means of self-defensiveness. Furthermore, it is thought to be associated with negative social outcomes. Thus the potential benefits of forbearance to deal with interpersonal conflicts in collectivistic culture are undermined, which is the major reason that we emphasize forbearance instead of sticking with emotional suppression.

Forbearance and Collectivistic Coping

Other research teams have investigated constructs closer to our conceptualization of forbearance. For example, Yeh et al. (2005) considered *forbearance* as the withholding of one's opinions and emotions in a conflict, in the hope of maintaining social harmony. Their definition of forbearance is much closer to ours than what has been typically considered to be emotional suppression. Furthermore, Yeh et al. (2005) identified forbearance as one of a number of collectivistic coping strategies, which also included family support, respect for authority, relational universality, etc. Yeh et al. (2005) have included in their definition only one motivation for forbearing—the hope of maintaining social harmony. This is indeed important in collectivist societies (Fukuhara, 1989; Yeh & Inose, 2002), but to include that restriction in the definition might be unnecessarily restrictive.

Wei et al. (2012) investigated whether forbearance coping for Chinese international students is associated with lower psychological distress with two moderators: identification with heritage culture and acculturative stress. They defined *forbearance* as a coping strategy for Chinese international students to minimize or conceal their problems for the sake of group

harmony or avoid bringing burden to others. While Wei et al.'s definition was more expansive than was Yeh et al.'s, they limited the motivations for forbearance to two motives. They hypothesized that if a Chinese student maintained a strong home-culture identification, which usually means that he or she will be more likely to get social support from other Chinese students, then his or her acculturative distress level may have no relationship with which kind of coping strategy (e.g. forbearance) he or she uses. Chinese international students ($N=188$) completed online surveys, including forbearance coping measured by the forbearance subscale of the Collectivistic Coping Style Measure (CCSM, Moore and Constantine, 2005), identification with heritage culture measured by the Heritage subscale of Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA, Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000) and psychological distress measured by Hopkins Symptoms Checklist-21 item version (HSC; Green, Walkey, McCormick, & Taylor, 1988). The results were consistent with their hypotheses based on their definition of forbearance. They found that forbearance coping had a positive correlation with psychological distress only for those with weaker identification with their heritage culture when their acculturative stress was higher. But there was no association between forbearance coping and psychological distress when their acculturative stress was lower. No matter whether acculturative stress was high or low, there was no association between forbearance coping and psychological distress for those students with a strong home culture identification.

Measure of Forbearance

Moore and Constantine (2005) regarded forbearance as a collectivistic coping style, but defined it a little differently from me. They saw forbearance as the tendency to minimize or conceal problems or concerns so as not to trouble or burden others (pp.331). Compared with Yeh et al. (2005)'s definition, Moore and Constantine (2005) seemed to go beyond "inhibition,"

“suppression,” or “withholding,” and go further towards more manipulative action, such as to minimize or conceal problems. In addition, “not to trouble or burden others” as the purpose of forbearance (Moore & Constantine, 2005; p. 331) sounds (to me) not as compelling—at least from a collectivistic viewpoint—as “to maintain social harmony” (Yeh et al., 2005), which is a phrase one hears frequently in collectivistic cultures.

Based on their conceptualizations, Moore and Constantine (2005) developed and provided some psychometric support of the Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (CCSM), a 9-item scale to measure two styles that international students use to cope with problems. Forbearance coping style is one of the styles and the other is seeking social help. Items for the CCSM Scale were generated using a literature review of African American, Latin, and Asian International Students, focus groups with members of this population, and previous clinical experience with this population. Then researchers sent 400 international students (Asian, African and Latin) packets with the CCSM, and other scales (Self Construal Scale, Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, Interpersonal Relationship Harmony Index, The Coping Strategies Inventory, and Attitudes toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help Scale) to address concurrent, divergent, and convergent validity for the CCSM. To establish evidence for test-retest estimated reliability, participants were invited to take the second part of the study (time 2) on campus. Only 30 students completed the second measure to provide evidence of estimated test re-test reliability of the CCSM. But the forbearance subscale had small correlations with Self-Construal Scale-interdependence and -independence subscales. The forbearance subscale also showed weak two-week estimated temporal stability. In addition, Moore and Constantine collected only one sample, and thus their findings were not replicated or cross-validated on a different sample. Therefore, their forbearance subscale needs cross-

validation if it is to be a usable measure. (At a minimum, my study will provide evidence relating to cross validation of the Moore and Constantine measure because we will use it as a criterion against which we hope to validate my measure.)

Overall, there are four definitions of forbearance that have been investigated empirically. The most compelling is to treat forbearance as suppression of the expression of emotion after experiencing a hurt or offense, which was most closely approximated by Yeh et al. (2005) and less so by Moore and Constantine (2005) (because they did not refer to social harmony as a motive). Even though Butler et al. (2007) defined the construct as inhibiting emotion, they measured it as inhibiting emotional expression. Thus, I believe that my definition captures the essence of the construct of forbearance.

Forbearance: the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., emotional expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony.

Overarching Theoretical Framework: The *New Big Five* Personality Processes (McAdams & Pals, 2006)

In an effort to contribute a comprehensive framework to personality psychology, McAdams and Pals (2006) put forward five fundamental principles for understanding a whole person. They conceive of personality as an individual's uniqueness. People are unique due to differences in five domains—the “new big five” *processes* in contrast to Costa and McCrae's Big

Five *personality factors*. The new big five personality processes are these: evolutionary, dispositional, adaptational, narrative, and cultural processes. Below are the detailed analyses:

1. Evolution and human nature provide a general design that all the individuals should share the similar human nature despite under different social consequences.

2. Dispositional traits can tell how people feel, think and behave across situations and over time, which are the most stable, broad and rough outlines of human individuality.

3. Compared with dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations, such as motives, goals, values, plans, virtues, etc., are contextualized in time, place or social role.

4. Life narratives are life stories that individuals construct to construe their own lives, to make meaning and to establish their own identity.

5. Culture influences the development of dispositional traits, characteristic adaptations and life narratives in different ways.

Application of the New Big Five Personality Processes to My Conceptualization of Forbearance

Evolutionary process. No research has investigated the evolutionary roots of forbearance. However, much research has examined the roots of reconciliation. McCullough (2008) argues that boundary violations in a group must be punished and sanctions applied to stop or minimize such transgressions. But, argues McCullough, if there were no corresponding reconciliation process, groups would be at an evolutionary survival disadvantage because of predation on animals that were hurt or ostracized from the group. Thus, reconciliation and justice are perpetually held in tension in great ape and monkey primate groups as well as human primate

groups. This is true of the most ancient human ancestors and can even be seen in animals with which humans share the most DNA today—bonobos, chimpanzees, and other great apes and monkeys. DeWaal (1989) has described the reconciliation process that he claims is built in via evolutionary processes. An offending animal generally approaches the offended higher ranking animal with head lowered and hand outstretched. The offending animal does not display aggressive and hostile emotions. We might say that this restraint is suppression of emotional expression, though in less evolved groups than humans, it is not likely that higher order reasoning provides a prosocial group motive like “for the good of the group.” Nevertheless, this might be seen as the evolutionary beginning of forbearance, just as the offended animal might display the evolutionary beginning of forgiveness and also forbearance.

Dispositional traits. Gross and his research group investigated several negative outcomes associated with chronic use of expressive suppression of emotions (Gross, 2002; Gross & John, 2003; John & Gross, 2004; Gottman & Levenson, 1988; Levenson & Gottman, 1985). For instance, Gross and John (2003) found that people who habitually use expressive suppression are viewed as inauthentic and masking their true feelings, which often misleads others about themselves. Furthermore, they are less likely to repair negative moods and more likely to ruminate about them. They tend to experience less positive emotion and more negative emotion, including bad feelings of inauthenticity. In addition, it seems hard for these emotion suppressors to share emotionally with others and establish close relationships. In terms of well-being, the suppressors may report lower self-esteem, less life satisfaction and more symptoms of depression. In these studies, suppression of emotional expression is mostly operationalized as a trait---repeated use of the emotion regulation strategy. John and Gross (2003) found that

suppression (measured by ERQ) was not related to neuroticism (measured by big five), but was related to low extraversion.

Characteristic adaptations. Characteristic adaptations indicate the importance of considering contexts in whether a person forbears in response to a transgression. Context is important because even a person who is highly forbearing, by trait, might not automatically forbear negative response to any transgression at any time in any place. Because most research about expressive suppression is more in the intrapersonal than interpersonal context (Butler & Gross, 2004; Butler, Lee, & Gross, 2007), Chiang (2012) suggested that it is vital to consider when, where, and with whom one is interacting in a relationship when studying forbearance. “With whom” is frequently studied in Chinese culture as the relational context. For example, the perceived horizontal distances (close or distant) and vertical status (upper or lower) in an interpersonal relationship are regarded as the guidance for an individual in Chinese society to either express or forbear expression of emotion (Liu, 2002; Peng, 1993; Yan, 1998; Zhang, 2007; Zhuang & Yang, 1997;). More specifically, if a person perceives a relationship as close and equal, he or she is more likely to express his or her true feelings without much hesitation; if a person perceives a relationship as distant or dramatically different in power (e.g., employer and employee, older person and young kid), he or she tends to forbear the expression of affect, especially negative affect.

Furthermore, Huang (2009) proposed a model of interpersonal relationship types in Chinese society, including emotion-tied type, purpose-tied type and mixed type. Whether a person chooses to express negative emotions or forbear emotions depends on the relationship type. It is fairly understandable that people often share true feelings in an emotion-tied relationship while they often conceal or minimize their affect in a purpose-tied relationship

because they expect getting comfort and support from the previous relationship, and try not to show weakness in front of people who may potentially judge them in the latter relationship. But it becomes complicated and unpredictable when the relationship is a mixed type. Considering the contexts (e.g., where and when) will be important to determine whether to express or forbear feelings.

The research mentioned above mostly addressed dyads in a relationship. But what happens if there are more than two people in a relationship? Will people make different decisions just because of a group setting? Tajfel and Turner's (1979) social identity theory suggests that people tend to benefit in-group members with valuable resources at the cost of out-group members. But Fiske (2010) indicated that one's group identity also depends on context. When group commitment is low, an individual often puts his or her personal preferences or concerns as priority or even chooses to get out of the group, especially when the self is threatened. However, when group commitment is high, an individual tends to prioritize group needs or concerns and even sacrifice his or her own needs, especially if individual preferences may threaten group cohesion. In terms of expressing or forbearing negative emotions, group commitment can function as a moderator, which shapes an individual's decisions in the group. For example, if a person who is highly committed to a group is offended by another person in the same group, he or she is more likely to assess whether complaining about the offense and offender will affect the group cohesion and if so, he or she may choose to forbear the expression of negative affect associated with the offense for the sake of group harmony. But if the same offense happens to another person who does not have strong commitment to the group, he or she is more likely to feel free to express his or her frustration or anger because of no pressure to protect anybody else's feelings or to maintain the group's peace.

Life narratives. Miller and Sperry (1987) illustrated the importance of considering one's life experience to evaluate whether his/her behaviors are adaptive or not. They found that mothers who lived in poor neighborhoods outside of Baltimore, MD, encouraged their children to show aggression towards conflicts, otherwise the children will be called sissies. These mothers explained that acting out one's anger is necessary for a child to survive in a tough neighborhood. Mothers' life experience informed children to behave in an adaptive way, which is obviously not effective for people living in high SES suburban area outside of New York City. Similarly, even within the same culture, people who have had some particular life experience which suggests forbearance may be more likely to forbear their emotions than those people without the life experience.

Culture influences. In contrast to most people perceiving suppression of emotion as leading to mostly negative outcomes in the Western world, forbearance is traditionally and usually viewed positively in the Eastern world. For example, Wang and Dai (2011) proposed forbearance as a meta-value or "a master value" (Joffe & Staerkle, 2007) in Chinese society. They defined forbearance as "a capacity developed against one's original, immediate biological desire to compromise with the immediate social-cultural or moral-affective environment and external power, with a particular purpose or objective to fulfill in time" (p. 401). Forbearance enables a person to pursue a long-term and unremitting goal for one's personal ambitions (i.e., economic status, moral/political convictions) in whatever conditions or contexts that exist (i.e., harsh life conditions, traumatic events). In daily life, forbearance is shown when a person has to do something against his or her will or has to stop doing something that he or she desires to do. Forbearance is seen as a meta-norm to define or control the other norms required for particular tasks. Wang and Dai (2011) established a stereotyping model based on the Chinese forbearance

ethos with Xu Ming-kui's, *The 100 Exhortations to Forbearance* (The 100EF), a classic work of the Yuan Dynasty in China. Wang and Dai derived 10 dyads of parameters (self and others) that are interconnected to form a hierarchy for a person's forbearance development. Interpretations of each dyad focused on the symmetricity and reciprocity (SR) of selfing and othering in the hierarchy. Thus the behaviors of forbearance not only benefit others (interpersonally), but also benefit self (intrapersonally). Some salient examples from dyad 1 follow: SR 3 shows that a person should avoid showing harmful emotions towards himself or herself or towards others. Thus he or she should restrain the immediate anger, rage, pride, arrogance, and grievance and replace those emotions with harmonious emotions. SR 5 shows that a person should conquer nine hardships, including sad feelings. In addition, one should forbear such desires for power, favor, influence, and competition. SR 6 shows that one should endure adversities and forbear from such verbal behaviors as laughing at the inappropriate time, slandering others and boasting about one's achievements. SR 10 shows that a person should also practice forbearance towards family members. For instance, husbands should be benevolent to their wives and wives should be obedient to their husbands. Father and son as well as brothers should not blame or resent each other.

Culture offers necessary organization and coordination for people in the same groups who can socialize with each other and learn different social roles, norms and expectations. Without the social order maintained through culture, there will be social chaos that may jeopardize the survival or well-being or meaning-making of its members (Matsumoto, 2007a). Values, products of culture, provide guidelines for people to pursue goals and generate motivations (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 2006). Matsumoto, Yoo, and Nakagawa (2008) suggested two types of values to understand emotion regulation: values related to interpersonal

relationships and to emotions. Value orientations related to interpersonal relationships include Individualism versus Collectivism (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988); Embeddedness versus Autonomy (Schwartz, 2004); and Egalitarianism versus Hierarchy (Schwartz, 2004). Value orientations related to emotions include Uncertainty Avoidance (Hofstede, 1980); Long- versus Short-Term Orientation (Hofstede, 2001); and Affective Autonomy (Schwarz, 2004). In the study by Matsumoto et al. (2008), university students ($N = 3018$) from 23 countries on 5 continents filled out questionnaires, such as an emotion suppression questionnaire, Hofstede dimensions, long-versus short-term orientation, and positive adjustment and maladjustment. Matsumoto et al. found that emotion suppression had a positive correlation with many collectivistic values while having a negative correlation with individualism. Specifically, cultures that value maintenance of social order, which includes embeddedness (within a collective) that encourages conformity and discourages individuals from dissenting and standing out, hierarchy, and long-term orientation scored higher on suppression, while cultures that value individual freedom and achievement, including affective autonomy and egalitarianism, scored lower on suppression.

There are two studies investigating the effect of culture on emotion suppression for American students and Chinese students. In the study by Soto et al. (2011) study, 71 European American College (EAC) students in the U.S and 100 Hong Kong Chinese (HKC) college students completed some surveys measuring emotion suppression and psychological well-being, including an emotion regulation questionnaire, satisfaction with life scale, and center for epidemiologic studies depression scale. Culture was found to be the moderator for the relationship of expressive suppression and psychological functioning. For HKC, the habitual use of suppression was not associated with negative psychological functioning while for EAC,

expressive suppression was positive correlated with adverse psychological health. In English and John's (2012) study, 157 university students in the U.S and 114 undergraduates in mainland China filled out questionnaires, including an emotion suppression questionnaire, relationship satisfaction, satisfaction with life scale and subjective authenticity. They found that Chinese participants scored higher than American ones in habitual use of suppression.

In addition, Hu and Huang (2006) proposed that forbearing-modesty might be one aspect of self-modesty in Chinese society that emphasizes forbearance when showing modesty to others, especially to transgressors. Yue (2001) traced the value of forbearance with several traditional Chinese ethics. For example, both Confucian ethics of self-cultivation and Taoist ethics of self-transcendence promote a sense of self-enlightenment about the complexity of the world that fosters forbearance to maintain a sense of inner harmony. The tendency to maintain social harmony and forbear emotional expression for the sake of group harmony during conflict or problems occurred not only among Chinese, but also among Japanese (Fukuhara, 1989) and other Asian students (Yeh & Inose, 2002). Though some early studies did not employ the term of forbearance, it became a consensus that Asian cultures value suppressing both expression of emotions (Tashima & Ito, 1982) and conflicts (Fugita, Eto, Abe, & Takeuchi, 1991) to promote interpersonal harmony.

Summary

In the foregoing section, I have tried to conceptualize forbearance within the new big five process model (McAdams & Pals, 2006). This is not a causal theory as much as an organizing framework within which one might view forbearance. As a means of examining potential causal antecedents and consequences of forbearance, I examine cultural models of self and relating.

Cultural Models of Self and Relating

Forbearance can be viewed as a way of emotion regulation in a cultural context. Mesquita and Albert (2006) employed cultural models of self and relating to describe how emotion regulation is enmeshed into the meanings and practices of a culture.

They conceptualized cultural models as manifestation in mental processes (e.g., emotion), instead of as predictors of them. They proposed that culture regulates individuals' emotions by increasing the likelihood of an emotional response that is consistent with the cultural model (i.e., activation of emotions) and by decreasing the likelihood of an emotional response that is inconsistent with the cultural model (i.e., avoidance of emotions). In addition, they argued that the social-cultural world not only offers the opportunities of emotion experiences and attaches meanings to these experiences, but also creates the norms of emotion expression.

Mesquita and Albert (2006) believed that the process of emotion varies in different people, and according to different emotions and cultural contexts. Furthermore, they hypothesized that the processes of emotion generation and emotion regulation were inseparable because both processes are primarily affected by response selection where accessibility and expected rewards or punishment of emotional responses play important roles.

Specifically, they discussed three ways that culture might regulate emotions: (a) situation selection, (b) situation modification and attentional deployment, and (c) appraisal regulations. I will also discuss how forbearance can be either promoted in some cultures or discouraged in other cultures.

Situation selection. Gross (1998, p. 283) defined situation selection as “approaching or avoiding certain people, places, or objects in order to regulate emotions.” Emotions can be

regulated in certain cultures by either promoting or inhibiting the occurrence of some situations when certain emotions are elicited. For example, because people from the USA are interested in promoting individuals' happiness, they tend to provide various opportunities (time, place, rewards, etc.) for people to enjoy the happiness. In the contrast, because Japanese believe that fear or shame can help a person to realize his or her obligations to others and fulfill others' expectations, they encourage people to own the feelings of fear or shame when searching their weaknesses and trying to improve those weaknesses. Furthermore, culture can shape the patterns and dynamics of social interactions to generate or moderate emotion fit with the desired culture model. For example, American culture advocates individuals' free expression of emotions, which is believed to promote happiness or decrease depression. On the contrary, Japanese culture teaches people not to express emotions that are not appropriate or in inappropriate ways because over-expression of emotions will prevent them from fulfilling their obligations to others.

Situation modification and attentional deployment. People are motivated to modify their situations and deploy their attention to culturally-desired goals. Culture serves as a GPS to navigate the social world, such as suggesting the necessary social information when making emotional judgment, selecting strategies for parenting, etc. Appraisal regulation: People's emotional experiences are largely determined by their ways of appraising a situation. Appraisal is a process of meaning-making in a cultural context. Culture moderates situation appraisals by providing cultural schemas and identifying the specific sources of meaning. For example, in one study, Mesquita et al. (2006) found that American students considered others' perspectives less than Japanese counterparts when thinking of the meanings of an event.

Similarly, with regulating emotions, culture also regulates action readiness (i.e., behavioral goals), actual behavior and behavioral means by providing cultural norms and schemas, and creating specific cultural contexts.

Summary

Forbearance can occur in either or multiple of the circumstances: in a situation that is selected or modified to fit with the desired cultural goals; When a conflict occurs, in a culture where forbearance is normative, people tend to avoid expressing negative emotions when it is expected to bring the temporary catharsis for themselves, but to damage the group harmony or relationships with others. However, in a culture where forbearance is not normative, people tend to feel free to express themselves after which they may feel less miserable compared with when the offense occurs in a situation that is perceived as something that is consistent with cultural schemas. When a conflict occurs, in a culture where forbearance is normative, people tend to think about the situations from a more holistic perspective, rather than from an individual's perspective. They often make a decision to either forbear or express their emotions based on whether or not their behaviors will interrupt the whole group or the majority of the group.

Discussion

Based on the literature reviewed above, forbearance should be conceptualized in a cultural context. In summary, I proposed three propositions related to forbearance.

Proposition 1: People's general forbearance level in collectivistic cultures is higher than that in individualistic cultures. Culture is a moderator between forbearance and psychological consequences.

In a culture where forbearance is normative (primarily a collectivistic culture), forbearance contributes not only to group harmony, but also to inner harmony of individuals whose values are congruent with its primary culture. Therefore, to those individuals, forbearance may not link with psychological distress as evidenced in many other studies where forbearance is culturally discouraged. This is especially true in Asian cultures. For example, Yue (2001) indicated that in China, both Confucian ethics of self-cultivation and Taoist ethics of self-transcendence promote a sense of self-enlightenment about the complexity of the world that fosters forbearance to maintain a sense of inner harmony.

Culture can cut across other aspects than country or Eastern-Western divisions in the world. For example, in the military, emotional expression of some emotions is discouraged, usually emotions like anxiety or fear, sadness or depression, guilt and shame. However, other emotions are encouraged, usually emotions like anger. So, within a military culture, forbearance of the expression of certain emotions is encouraged but not other emotions. Again, though, military culture is highly collectivistic. Warriors are highly protective of their close associates and friends, protective of their service obligation (i.e., army, marines, navy, or air force), and somewhat protective of their country. They are acculturated that individual identity is to be subjugated to comrades, service, and country. Group solidarity is prized. Expression of fear, sadness, or weakness are threats to group solidarity. Thus forbearance of those emotions are discouraged. However, expressions of anger and aggression—directed to out-groups—is prized because it stimulates group warrior mentality and solidarity. Culture and its effects are complex, but collectivism tends to promote forbearance of emotional expression that might disrupt group harmony.

One might conceptualize stigma for help-seeking within this framework. Sometimes, families discourage their members from seeking help because the collectivistic identification of family members with the family group is threatened by the knowledge that members might be seeking help. The acknowledged inadequacy of a member of the family group to deal productively with his or her emotions and the acknowledgement that other family members are inadequate to help the person threaten the group. Forbearance of negative emotional expression is encouraged.

There has been actually only one study (Wei et al., 2012) investigating forbearance and its psychological outcomes. A couple of studies examined culture effect on emotion suppression. Though Wei et al. (2012)'s definition and conceptualization of forbearance is somewhat different from mine, and I argued before that there is difference between forbearance and emotion suppression, some common factors in the studies can be drawn to inspire the forbearance study in the future. Wei et al. (2012) incorporated two moderators (levels of identification with heritage culture and levels of acculturative stress) into the investigation of the relationship between forbearance and psychological consequences. They found that forbearance coping had a positive correlation with psychological distress only for those with weaker identification with their heritage culture when their acculturative stress was higher. It can be interpreted that when a Chinese international student has a high acculturative stress, he or she may use forbearance coping to deal with it, but because he or she is not strongly identified with Chinese heritage, forbearance may be viewed as only emotion suppression, rather than an effective collective coping strategy. Perhaps emotion suppression leads to higher levels of psychological distress.

Through a survey study, Butler et al. (2007) found that participants with primary European values scored lower in habitual suppression than their counterparts with bicultural

European-Asian values. Compared with bi-cultural participants, participants with European values reported more self-protective goals and higher level of negative emotion associated with suppression. In another experimental study, they found that culture served as a moderator for the relationship of suppression and negative perceptions by others. For instance, suppressors with primary European values were perceived as more hostile and withdrawn than their counterparts with bi-cultural values.

In Soto et al. (2011)'s study, culture was found to be the moderator for the relationship of expressive suppression and psychological functioning. For Hong Kong Chinese college students, the habitual use of suppression was not associated with negative psychological functioning while for European American college students, expressive suppression was positive correlated with adverse psychological health.

English and John (2012) found that Chinese participants (from mainland China) scored higher than American ones (from the U.S) in habitual use of suppression. In a study that expanded to 23 countries on 5 continents, Matsumoto et al. (2008) found that participants with cultures that value maintenance of social order, such as embeddedness, hierarchy and long-term orientation, scored higher on suppression while participants with cultures that value individual freedom and achievement, such as affective autonomy and egalitarianism, scored lower on suppression.

Proposition 2: Even in a culture where forbearance is normative, individuals may suppress their negative emotions or expression of emotions not due to the concern of group harmony.

Without giving a definition of forbearance, Chiang (2012) regarded forbearance as one of valuable emotion-regulation strategies dealing with interpersonal conflicts in Chinese culture. In order to understand forbearance and its cause among college students' interpersonal relationships, Chiang (2012) adopted qualitative methods—i.e., individual interviews and mood logs from college students. In terms of individual interviews, 24 participants in Taiwan were recruited, and each was assigned to an interviewer. The interview was semi-structured, and it followed a manual instructing interviewers how to approach participants with specific questions. These questions include recalling a transgression that happened within a year, talking about the emotional responses to the transgression and how they adjusted their emotions, and reflecting on how they think of their coping strategies. In terms of mood logs, students in a class were instructed to log their emotion with details when an interpersonal conflict occurs during a four-month semester. Twenty-two subjects with specific events and reasons were selected. The content of the mood logs were similar to the response to the interview questions mentioned above. Chiang (2012) found that the main reasons for college students in Taiwan to forbear experiencing or expressing their negative emotion include maintaining group harmony, replacing impulse with rationality, avoiding the embarrassment at the moment, preventing the negative consequences, obeying the traditional value/morals/ethics, finding unhelpful to express feelings and having no idea as to how to express feelings appropriately. “Avoiding the embarrassment at the moment”, “preventing the negative consequences”, and “obeying the traditional value” can be interpreted as the motivations related to “for the sake of group harmony”. However, “replacing impulse with rationality”, “finding unhelpful to express feelings” and “having no idea of how to express feelings” appear to have no relationship with group harmony.

Proposition 3: Even in a culture where forbearance is not normative, people might also react to complex conditions and forbear expression of negative emotions after experiencing a transgression.

Individualism and collectivism are shown not only across countries/cultures but also within (Katayama et al., 2010). For example, people from Asian countries, Middle East, Africa and Latin American countries will likely be higher in collectivism and lower in individualism than people from Western European and Canadian countries. But even within the State of Virginia in the U.S, people born and raised near Fairfax or Washington DC, are likely to be higher in individualism and lower in collectivism than are people born and raised in rural communities, small towns, and portions of southwestern Virginia, which in turn are likely to differ from people raised in suburban Central Virginia or suburban Virginia Beach. Consistent with what I proposed earlier, forbearance may occur among people who were born and raised in a more collectivistic sub-culture in a country where collectivism and forbearance are not normative.

Arens (2013) even argued that healthy individuals can manage emotions flexibly. Switching between a preference for engagement reappraisal when intensity of emotion is low, and disengagement when the intensity of the emotion is high. The effectiveness of adaptive strategies might also depend on other regulation strategies present in an individual's repertoire, allowing them to switch between strategies that might be differently adaptive for different context. In one study, researchers examine whether expressive flexibility is predicts long term adjustment to highly demanding life circumstances. Usage of one strategy over another failed to predict better adjustment. Having an ability to use both expression and suppression predicted

long-term success. A similar result was found in a sample of widows after bereavement (Arens, 2013).

Research Agenda

Based on this summary of research, I recommend the following research directions for the field.

1. The investigation of forbearance is still at the beginning stage. Definition and conceptualization of forbearance have substantial overlap with other social constructs, such as emotion suppression and suppression of emotional expression. It becomes a challenging task to borrow some methodology from the study of emotion suppression while differentiation of the two constructs is still noted. A separate literature (conceptual and empirical) is needed to understand forbearance. The propositions in the model I have put forth in the present chapter need to be tested.
2. There has been only one published measure of forbearance coping for international students. Moore and Constantine (2005) developed and provided some validation of the Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (CCSM), a 9-item scale to measure two styles that international students use to cope with problems. But the forbearance subscale has some weakness in psychometric properties and at least needs replication or cross-validation if it is a usable measure. More investigation of this existed measure or creating a more comprehensive measure is warranted.
3. As forbearance is conceptualized as normative in some collectivistic culture, it may be helpful to recruit participants in one collectivistic culture and see whether the same factors will be present to support the structure of the forbearance measure.

4. The amount and frequency of forbearance that people seem to hold toward transgression or transgressor seems to be a function of culture. As described in the cultural model of self and relating, forbearance is the product of meaning and practice embedded in the culture that values meeting obligations to others beyond one's own needs. But researchers also need to determine the causal variables explaining the difference of cultural meaning or preference. Is it self-construal? Might it be due to different cultural narratives? To what degree is it due to different histories of conflict within societies or between societies? For example, the Middle East, Balkans, and China have histories that are filled with conflict. Other countries or regions have spent large portions of their histories under the domination of an outside group either militarily (such as the Roman rule of the European and North African areas) or culturally (such as Greek cultural dominance in that same region). Might countries or regions that have been characterized by subjugation differ from those that have experienced lots of conflict? Other areas (like the United States) have recent histories and have little experience with conflict (e.g., the relatively short conflicts with England, and the American Civil War). Might their histories have shaped the way that they deal with conflicts, especially the way to forbear the conflicts?
5. Research is needed into the situational and the personality antecedents to forbearance.
6. Research is needed into the physical effects, mental health reactions and effects, relational effects, and perhaps spiritual effects of forbearance within different cultural contexts.
7. Moderators between antecedents and forbearance are needed.
8. Moderators between forbearance and various effects are needed.

9. The antecedents and consequences of forbearance in significant relationships (e.g., marriage and family) need to be investigated.
10. As it was suggested earlier that within a military culture, forbearance of the expression of certain emotions is encouraged, the more investigations of forbearance in the military (i.e. which kinds of emotions are encouraged to forbear and which kinds of emotions are discouraged) are needed.

Statement of the Problem for Three Studies

Few researchers have studied forbearance, and even fewer studies used the term of forbearance directly in the western world. Forbearance is a valued concept in many collectivistic cultures, and no measure is available for use in such cultures. I define *forbearance* as the attempts to suppress the visible signs of emotion (emotional expression) and visible behaviors (suppression of the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives), often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony. Although a few loosely related concepts have measures (against which we hope to establish differential validity), no measure exists to assess forbearance consistent with my definition and conceptualization.

There are some closely related constructs. Though it is similar to forbearance, *emotional suppression* is generally seen as the means of self-defensiveness and is often associated with negative social outcomes in the western societies (Gottman & Levenson, 1988; Gross, 2002; Gross & John, 2003; John & Gross, 2004; Levenson & Gottman, 1985). Thus the potential benefits of forbearance to deal with interpersonal conflicts in collectivistic culture are undermined by the negativity of the construct of emotional suppression, which is the major reason that I emphasize forbearance instead of the construct of emotional suppression. Emotional suppression also sometimes refers to the suppression of the experience of emotion; whereas, I am

interested not in measuring how people try to inhibit their experience of emotion, but rather to what degree they suppress their overt expression of it. One measure in the literature that is similar to our conceptualization of forbearance is by Moore and Constantine (2005). They developed and provided some evidence supporting the construct validity of the Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (CCSM), a 9-item scale to measure two styles that international students use to cope with problems. Forbearance coping style was said to be one of them. But Moore and Constantine's forbearance subscale has small correlations with the interdependence and independence subscales of the Self-Construal Scale (SCS). It also shows weak two-week test-retest temporal stability. In addition, Moore and Constantine collected only one sample. They did not provide any cross-validation, and thus their evidence supporting construct validity might be sample-dependent. Therefore, their forbearance subscale is psychometrically weak. I hope to develop a scale that is psychometrically better supported.

In the current studies, I generated a forbearance scale, consisting initially of 72 items: a dispositional measure of forbearance. I collected two new samples. The first, reported in Study 1 ($N=468$), I split into three subsamples for winnowing of items and for initial cross-validation. The second sample, reported in Study 2 ($N=453$), I used to test its psychometric properties. To the extent that my construction of a short but psychometrically sound scale for measuring forbearance plus investigations of the phenomena of forbearance as part of the construct validity studies are successful, this opens the door to research within collectivistic cultures that will reveal more culturally sensitive and culturally relevant behavior than previous research that has focused solely on forgiveness. Forbearance is another relevant alternative in dealing with transgressions at a personal level within primarily collectivistic, but also individualistic, cultures. Yet there are also implications that additional knowledge about how people in collectivistic

cultures deal with transgressions through forbearing might permit more understanding and better interventions to promote harmonious relationships across cultures and foster more peace.

Study 1: Exploratory Factor Analyses

The purposes of Study 1 were to (a) create an initial measure of forbearance (i.e., initially the Forbearance Scale-72) and determine its factor structure; (b) winnow items to create a brief, face-valid and structurally-sound measure of one's forbearance, the Forbearance Scale; and (c) provide initial evidence of estimated internal consistency of the Forbearance Scale.

Method

Participants and procedure. All studies were approved by the university's institutional review board. Participants ($N = 468$; 144 men and 306 women; 18 did not report sex) were recruited at a large urban university in the eastern United States through undergraduate courses. They participated in exchange for a small amount of course credit. The age range for participants was 18-54 years (93.6% 18-24 years old; 5.3% 25-34 years old; 0.9% 35-44 years old; 0.2% 45-54 years old). The sample was diverse in terms of race/ethnicity (42.7% White; 19.5% African-American/Black; 19.7% Asian/Pacific Islander; 7.7% Latino/a; 0.7% Native American; 9.6% Other) and religious affiliation (19.5% Baptist; 4.0% Presbyterian; 17% Catholic; 4.7% Muslim; 4.4% Buddhist; 4.2% Hindu; 20.6% None; and 25.7% Other). After giving consent, participants completed demographic measures online. Then they rated the initial Forbearance Scale-72 items based on how they usually deal with offenses.

Measure. I generated an initial list of 67 face-valid items. My supervisor, who is an expert with many publications in the area of positive psychology, reviewed this initial list, suggested revisions, and provided five additional items. Thus, the initial item pool included 72 items (called the Forbearance Scale-72). Items were assessed on a 5-point rating ranging from 1

= *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. Higher scores on the scale indicated greater forbearance.

Results and Discussion

Cleaning the data. Data were cleaned and study measures were created using IBM Statistics SPSS – Version 22 (IBM Corp., 2013). The data were checked for lack of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of the residuals through examination of basic statistics and histograms. Because less than 2% of the item-level data were missing, findings may be considered free of bias that is typically attributed to incomplete data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

To permit an examination of cross validation, I randomly split the sample of 468 participants in three subsamples—of 250, 150 and 68. I split the subsamples unevenly assuming that winnowing of items and attempting to keep a similar participant-to-item ratio. Items, Factor Loadings, Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Communalities for Forbearance Scale-5 (Study 1) were reported in Table 2.

Table 2.

Items, Factor Loadings, Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Communalities for Forbearance Scale-5 (Study 1)

	Factor loadings	M	SD	Communalities
Item				
29. When I'm angry, I do not show it.	0.77	2.98	1.02	0.59
30. I won't express my negative emotions.	0.82	2.88	1.05	0.68
31. I try hard not to show anger.	0.57	3.42	0.99	0.32
33. When I'm resentful, I do not show it.	0.74	3.07	0.95	0.54
42. When I feel upset, I do not let others know it.	0.45	3.13	1.01	0.21

Note. The exploratory factor analysis is for the 5 items retained after eliminating items from the Forbearance Scale—72 (the form in which the instrument was administered). Each item is rated as 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree, or 5 strongly agree

Sample 1a. On the first subsample (Sample 1a) with 250 cases, I used the Eigenvalue rule (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree test (Cattell, 1966) to determine the optimal number of factors. One factor best described the data and also provided for a simple structure. After that, all items were analyzed using principal component analysis (PCA) constrained to one factor. Items were dropped that did not load at least .55 on the factor. The result was the 19-item Forbearance Scale-19. A PCA was run on the remaining 19 items to replicate factor loadings. All items met established criteria and were retained, again supporting the one-factor structure of the Forbearance Scale-19. The factor accounted for 32.47% of the total item variance. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the Forbearance Scale-19 was .93.

Sample 1b. A PCA was performed on the second, randomly selected subsample of 150 cases (Sample 1b). Based on the previous analysis, 19 items were included for this analysis, and I requested a forced one-factor solution. Items were dropped that did not load at least .55 on the factor. The final scale for Sample 1b consisted of 9 items loading onto one factor (i.e., the Forbearance Scale-9). The factor accounted for 34.43% of the total item variance. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the Forbearance Scale-9 was .88.

Sample 1c. I ran a third PCA on the third, randomly selected subsample of 68 cases (Sample 1c). After four items were dropped based on the established criteria, the final version of the Forbearance Scale consisted of 5 items measuring forbearance levels (called the Forbearance Scale-5), including item 29, 30, 31, 33, and 42. The factor accounted for 46.65% of the total item variance. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the Forbearance Scale-5 was .80. Items showed moderate to strong correlations with each other (between .41 and .70). These results provide initial evidence for the one-factor structure of the Forbearance Scale-5. Because items were

dropped based on the characteristics of one sample, we sought to replicate the factor structure with another completely independent sample in Study 2.

Study 2: Cross-validation of Factor Structure and Construct Validity

In Study 1, the data yielded a one-factor solution for the Forbearance Scale-5. The purposes of Study 2 are three-fold: (a) replicate the one-factor structure of the Forbearance Scale using an undergraduate sample and (b) provide additional evidence of the estimated internal consistency of the scale scores (both of which I report in Study 2A). To accomplish these, I employed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in Study 2A. However, I also want to report data bearing on construct validity. It is most convenient to separate the construct validity analyses into a separate Study 2B.

Method for Study 2A

Participants. A different sample of students ($N = 453$; 187 men and 256 women; 11 did not report sex) was recruited through undergraduate courses at the same university as in Study 1 but in a different semester. Participants received a small amount of course credit for participating in the study. The age range for participants was 18-54 years (94.8% 18-24 years old; 4.0% 25-34 years old; 0.9% 35-44 years old; 0.2% 45-54 years old). The sample was diverse in terms of race/ethnicity (41.4% White; 22.2% African-American/Black; 20.8% Asian/Pacific Islander; 8.1% Latino/a; 0.2% Native American; 7.2% Other) and religious affiliation (19.3% Baptist; 5.2% Presbyterian; 14.2% Catholic; 3.8% Muslim; 4.0% Buddhist; 5.2% Hindu; 20.2% None; and 28.1% Other).

Measure for study 2A. Participants completed the Forbearance Scale-72 developed in Study 1 (data in Study 1 had not, at that point, been analyzed), but only the Forbearance-5 items were considered in the analyses of Study 2.

Procedure. After giving consent, participants completed demographic measures online. Then they rated the revised Forbearance Scale items based on how they usually deal with offenses.

Results for Study 2A

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The covariance matrix was analyzed with MLR estimation using *Mplus* 6.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) was used for missing data. To determine overall model fit, I examined several fit indices: χ^2 , the comparative fit index (CFI), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). As a rule of thumb, a CFI of approximately .95, an SRMR equal to or less than .08, and an RMSEA equal to or less than .06 suggest good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Also as a rule of thumb, a CFI of approximately .90, an SRMR equal to or less than .10, and an RMSEA equal to or less than .08 suggest adequate fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Results of the CFA. I found that the one-factor model showed good fit, $\chi^2(5, N = 453) = 12.99, p = .02, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .06$ (95% confidence interval [CI] = .02, .10), and SRMR = .03. Factor loadings were all statistically significant. Thus, the results using the sample 2A provided additional support for the one-factor structure and internal consistency of the Forbearance Scale-5.

Statement of the Problem for Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)

Differentiating forbearance from related constructs (i.e., emotion regulation, forbearance within the collectivistic coping styles, and emotional expressivity). Having established a stable simple structure for the Forbearance Scale-5 across two independent samples involving 921 participants, I focused Study 2B on providing initial evidence supporting the

construct validity for the Forbearance Scale-5. Participants completed the Forbearance Scale-5 as well as other measures. I hypothesized that the Forbearance Scale-5 would show evidence supporting convergent and discriminant validity.

Emotion regulation consists of cognitive reappraisal and emotional suppression (Gross & John, 2003). Thus, people with high scores on emotion regulation should be expected to show high scores on either cognitive reappraisal or expressive suppression or both. I defined forbearance as the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., suppress emotional expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony. Thus, people with high scores on the Emotion Regulation Scale (especially on the expressive suppression subscale) should also be expected to exhibit high forbearance.

The Forbearance subscale of the Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure assesses the tendency to avoid (1) sharing problems with others or (2) seeking help for fear of burdening others (Moore & Constantine, 2005). Moore and Constantine suggest that people with high scores on the Forbearance subscale of the Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (CCSM) should be expected to keep their problems or concerns to themselves. Therefore, people with high forbearance on the CCSM should exhibit high forbearance in the newly created and tested scale, the Forbearance Scale-5.

Emotional expressivity is assessed by three facets, including negative expressivity, positive expressivity, and impulse strength (Gross & John, 1997). In the present study, only negative expressivity was included. Gross and John suggest that people with high scores on negative expressivity should be expected to show high levels of expressive behaviors in response to negative events (Gross & John, 1997). Because of the way I defined forbearance (see above),

people with high emotional expressivity should also be expected to exhibit low forbearance on the Forbearance Scale-5.

Relationship of forbearance to independent and interdependent self-construal. Self-construal includes independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal (Singelis, 1994). Independent self-construal is characterized by individuals' emphasis on their own feelings, thoughts, behaviors and accomplishments while interdependent self-construal is characterized by connectedness with others in the group (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Matsumoto et al. (2008) found that emotion suppression had a positive correlation with many collectivistic values while having a negative correlation with individualism. Because of the way I defined forbearance (see above) that puts group harmony to priority for many, but not all who forbear, forbearance would be hypothesized to be significantly positively correlated with interdependent self-construal and negatively correlated with independent self-construal.

Relationship of forbearance to the Big Five personality traits. In the Big Five Inventory, Agreeableness reflects individual differences in general concern for social harmony, and Agreeableness measures the extent to which individuals get along with others and are willing to compromise their interests with others (Rothmann & Coetzer, 2003). Neuroticism measures the tendency to experience and express negative emotions. People with low Neuroticism scores are less easily upset and less emotionally reactive (Jeronimus, Riese, Sanderman, & Ormel, 2014). Due to my definition of forbearance (see above), people with high Agreeableness should be expected to exhibit high forbearance while people with low neuroticism may exhibit high forbearance.

Exploring whether group harmony is a sole motivator of forbearance. I defined forbearance as the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., emotional

expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony (cf. Yeh et al., 2005; also see Wei et al., 2012). However, people might forbear expression of negative emotion for a variety of reasons, not just for the sake of group harmony. For instance, people could be shy and not want to draw attention to the self. Or they could be emotionally constricted or have a learning history that punished the display of emotion.

Creation of the Forbearance for Group Harmony Index to test the motives for forbearing. Because a frequent motive for forbearance in collectivistic cultures is often unwillingness to disturb the harmony of the group, I created an index of one motivation for forbearing that has been particularly championed in many collectivistic cultures—forbearing for the sake of preserving harmony within a social group. I called this the Forbearance for Group Harmony Index. I hypothesized that the scores on the Forbearance Scale-5 would be related to scores on the Forbearance for Group Harmony Index, the measure of a participant's motivation to forbear for the sake of group harmony.

In the predominantly United States college population, I expected, on the basis of prior research (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), that most students would be individualistic and not highly collectivistic in their self-construal. Thus, I predicted a modest (but significant) relationship between scores on the Forbearance for Group Harmony Index and the Forbearance-5.

Forbearance and tendency to share negativity with others—a scenario measure. To provide additional evidence supporting the construct validity of the Forbearance-5 scale, I created a measure of participants' tendency to share negatively with others after a hypothetical offense.

Hypotheses. Thus, to provide an initial body of evidence of construct validity for the Forbearance Scale, I tested seven hypotheses:

1. Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ) would be positively related to Forbearance Scale-5.
2. Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure-Forbearance Subscale (CCSM) would be positively related to Forbearance Scale-5.
3. Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire (BEQ) would be negatively related to the Forbearance Scale-5.
4. Self-Construal Scale-Interdependence Subscale would be positively related to Forbearance Scale-5. To test the divergent validity, I hypothesized that Self-Construal Scale-Independence Subscale would show no correlation or negative correlation with Forbearance Scale-5.
5. Forbearance Scale-5 would be positively associated with Agreeableness and negatively associated with Neuroticism in Big Five Inventory.
6. Forbearance Scale-5 would a participant's motivation to forbear for the sake of group harmony. In the predominantly United States college population, I expected on the basis of prior research (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), that most students would be individualistic and not highly collectivistic in their self-construal. Thus, I predicted modest (but significant) relationship between scores on the Forbearance for Group Harmony index and the Forbearance-5.
7. Forbearance Scale-5 would predict how a participant responded to a described offense. Specifically, I hypothesized that Forbearance Scale-5 would be

negatively associated with scores on a created scale to measure participants' tendency to share negativity with others after a hypothetical offense.

Method for Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)

Participants. Participants were reported above.

Procedure for study 2B. After giving consent, participants completed demographic measures online and the Forbearance Scale-72, as reported above. As in Study 2A, only the items for the Forbearance Scale-5 were used in the analyses. Then participants completed other measures to test the construct validity of the Forbearance Scale 5.

In addition, participants read one scenario and answered four questions immediately following the scenario. The scenario was derived from Berry et al. (2001), in which five scenarios were subjected to item response theory (IRT) analyses. The scenario selected for the present study was the most difficult to forgive within the combined sample in Berry et al. according to the IRT analysis.

A fairly close friend tells you that he/she needs some extra money for an upcoming holiday. You know a married couple in your social group and with whom you have been close, who needs a babysitter for their 3-year-old for a couple of nights, and you recommend your friend. Your friend is grateful and takes the job. On the first night, the child gets out of bed, and while your friend has fallen asleep watching television, the child drinks cleaning fluid from beneath the kitchen sink. The child is taken by an ambulance to the hospital and stays there for two days for observation and treatment. After being furious at you and calling you irresponsible and telling you that you made a “stupid” recommendation that was unforgivable, the married couple will now not speak

to you even though you have repeatedly phoned, emailed and texted an apology (Berry et al., 2001, p.).

The instructions continued as follows.

After your initial remorse and feelings of guilt, you have tried to make things right with them. But they simply will not respond. Now you feel that they are being unreasonable and you feel like you need to confront them. After the above statement, participants will make four ratings:

1. How likely are you to confront them about their lack of responsiveness?

0 = No chance 1 = Slight chance 2 = Moderate chance 3 = Good chance 4 = Excellent chance

2. Because you are upset, how likely are you to show your negative feelings to them?

0 = No chance 1 = Slight chance 2 = Moderate chance 3 = Good chance 4 = Excellent chance

3. How likely are you to say anything negative about them to others whom you both know?

0 = No chance 1 = Slight chance 2 = Moderate chance 3 = Good chance 4 = Excellent chance

4. If you did criticize the couple, how likely is it that the group harmony would be damaged?

0 = No chance 1 = Slight chance 2 = Moderate chance 3 = Good chance 4 = Excellent chance

Measures for Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)

Emotion Regulation Questionnaires (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003). ERQ is a ten-item measure to assess two different emotion regulations, including cognitive reappraisal (six items) and expressive suppression (four items). Participants assessed each item on a 7-point rating

ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). An item measuring cognitive reappraisal is, “when I am faced with a stressful situation, I made myself think about it in a way that helps me stay calm”. An item measuring expressive suppression is “when I am feeling negative emotions, I make sure not to express them”. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for ERQ was .80.

Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire (BEQ; Gross and John, 1997). The 16-item questionnaire assesses three facets of emotional expressivity: negative expressivity (6 items), positive expressivity (4 items), and impulse strength (6 items). Subscale of negative expressivity is used in the current studies. Participants indicate their agreement on a 7-point rating ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). A sample item for negative expressivity is, “I’ve learned it is better to suppress my anger than to show it.” In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for BEQ was .67.

Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (CCSM; Moore and Constantine, 2005). Four-item forbearance subscale of this measure will be used in the current studies to assess the tendency to avoid sharing problems with others or seeking help for fear of burdening others. The forbearance subscale is assessed on a 5-point rating ranging from 1 (not used) to 5 (used often). One sample item is, “I keep the problem or concern to myself in order not to worry others”. The subscale has a coefficient alpha of .95 and a two-week estimated temporal reliability of .80 (Moore & Constantine, 2005) in a sample of international students from Africa, Asia and Latin America. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for the forbearance subscale was .78.

Self-Construal Scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994): Individualism and collectivism, which refers to one’s tendency to see himself or herself as independent or interdependent from others, were measured by the Self-Construal Scale (SCS; Singelis, 1994). The SCS consists of 24 items

that measure one's tendency to think of oneself as independent or interdependent from others. Twelve items assess the independent self, and twelve items assess the interdependent self. Items are randomly ordered, and participants rate each item on a 7-point rating scale from 1 = Strongly disagree to 7 = Strongly agree.. In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for the interdependent subscale was .83. Cronbach's alpha for the independent subscale was .88.

Big-Five Inventory of Personality (BFI-44 items; John & Srivastava, 1999). Five factors of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness) are assessed by Big-five Inventory of personality (BFI-44 items; John & Srivastava, 1999). Participants indicated their agreement on each item on a 5-point rating from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*. John and Srivastava (1999) reported Cronbach's alphas for the subscales ranging from .75-.80 and estimates of 3-month estimated temporal stability ranging from .80-.90. The subscales were found to be highly correlated with longer versions of the five factor model, such as the NEO (Costa & McCrae, 1992). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for the Agreeableness subscale was .77 and Cronbach's alpha for the Neuroticism subscale was .75.

Group Harmony Forbearance Index (created measure): I created an index of 4 items assessing one motivation for forbearing that has been particularly championed in collectivistic cultures—forbearing for the sake of preserving harmony within a social group. This index was created by extracting items from the Forbearance-72 that were not used in the Forbearance Scale-5 and also explicitly referred to suppressing emotional expression (or forbearance) for the sake of group harmony. Participants indicate their agreement on a 5-point rating ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). One sample item is, "I am trying to control my

expression of negative emotions for the sake of the group.” In the present study, Cronbach's alpha was .64.

Tendency to Show or Express Negative Feelings (created measure). The two-item measure consists of two questions selected from the four questions after the described scenario. Participants indicate their agreement on a 5-point rating ranging from 0 (*No Chance*) to 4 (*Excellent chance*). The two items are, “Because you are upset, how likely are you to show your negative feelings to them?” and “How likely are you to say anything negative about them to others whom you both know?” In the present study, Cronbach's alpha was .68.

Results of Study 2B (Evidence Supporting Construct Validity)

Scores on all items on Forbearance Scale-5 were assessed for missing data, normality, and the presence of outliers. All other scales were treated similarly to insure the accuracy of the data. In Table 3, I reported the means, standard deviations and all bivariate inter-correlations among all study variables. Because I reported 10 correlations, the Bonferroni corrected alpha was .005.

I hypothesized that I would find evidence of construct validity of the Forbearance Scale-5. The general pattern of findings provided evidence of convergent and discriminant validity. As predicted, Forbearance Scale-5 showed a moderately strong positive correlation with Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ; $p < .001$; Hypothesis 1) and Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure-Forbearance Subscale (CCSM; $p < .001$; Hypothesis 2). Forbearance Scale-5 showed a moderately strong negative correlation with Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire (BEQ; $p < .001$; Hypothesis 3). Also, as predicted, the Self-Construal Scale-Interdependence Subscale correlated moderately strongly with the Forbearance Scale-5 ($p < .001$; Hypothesis 4); the Self-Construal Scale-Independence Subscale showed no correlation with the Forbearance Scale-5

(also Hypothesis 4). In addition, Forbearance Scale-5 showed a modest association with the Agreeableness Subscale of Big Five Inventory ($p < .001$; Hypothesis 5). Forbearance Scale-5 showed a modest negative association with the Neuroticism Subscale of Big Five Inventory ($p < .001$; also Hypothesis 5). Different from my hypothesis that predicted a modest positive relationship, Forbearance Scale-5 showed a *strong* positive relationship with Group Harmony Forbearance Index ($p < .001$; Hypothesis 6). As hypothesized, Forbearance Scale-5 showed a modestly negative correlation with the created scale (Tendency to Show or Express Negative Feelings) after the described offense ($p < .001$; Hypothesis 7).

Table 3.

Intercorrelations of Forbearance Scale-5, Emotion Regulation Questionnaire, Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire-Negative Expressivity Subscale, Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure-Forbearance Subscale, Self-Construal Scale, Big-Five Inventory of personality-Agreeableness and Neuroticism, Group Harmony Forbearance Index, and Tendency to Show or Express Negative Feelings (Study 2)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Forbearance Scale-5	15.64	3.84	1									
2. Emotion Regulation	44.16	7.87	0.30*	1								
3. Negative Expressivity	22.38	5.11	-0.44*	-0.30*	1							
4. Collectivistic Coping Styles	14.4	3.13	0.35*	0.35*	-0.31*	1						
5. Self- Construal_Interdependence	58.78	9.78	0.29*	0.26*	-0.17*	0.36*	1					
6. Self- Construal_Independence	58.82	11.22	0.09	0.21*	-0.09	0.29*	0.49*	1				
7. Big-Five_Agreeableness	32.12	5.39	0.21*	0.29*	-0.19*	0.25*	0.34*	0.3*	1			
8. Big-Five_Neuroticism	23.6	5.11	-0.17*	-0.2*	0.26*	-0.08	-0.01	-0.24*	-0.28*	1		
9. Group Harmony Forbearance-4	12.89	2.53	0.51*	0.32*	-0.30*	0.35*	0.37*	0.11	0.17*	0.06	1	
10. Tendency to show or express negativity	5.94	1.81	-0.20*	-0.05	0.27*	-0.21	-0.06	-0.05	-0.18*	0.08	-0.13	1

Note. N=410 or fewer

* Bonferroni-corrected $p < .005$

Discussion for Study 2

Generally, the CFA supported the factor structure of the Forbearance-5. In the construct validity studies, the findings supported most of my hypotheses. For example, people with high emotion regulation exhibited high forbearance, which was in line with the theorizing and findings of Gross and John (2003). People with high forbearance in CCSM (Moore & Constantine, 2005) also showed high forbearance in Forbearance Scale-5 where forbearance is defined slightly differently from each other. Furthermore, people with high negative emotional expressivity reported low forbearance. As hypothesized, the higher Collectivism/interdependence people perceived themselves, the higher probability they chose to forbear the offender or the higher amount of forbearance they reported. However, independence self-construal was not significantly correlated to Forbearance Scale-5. Singelis (1994) asserted that both independent and interdependent conceptions of self can coexist in one individual. That means that an individual can have high or low scores on both independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal, which might explain why forbearance in the present study was not correlated to independence self-construal. Associations with Agreeableness and Neuroticism (Gross & John, 2003) were modest in size, indicating that the Forbearance Scale-5 converged with, but did not duplicate, these personality dimensions.

Study 3: Cross-Validation of Factor Structure in an International Sample

In the present study, I focused on an international sample that was diverse in terms of age, ethnicity, and religious affiliation to replicate the factor structure. To accomplish this, I employed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on this small sample (ratio of participants to items of $39/5 = 7.8$ suggested this met the rule of thumb (of 5:1), though a CFA of 39 participants is clearly underpowered.) Furthermore, I aimed to test Group-Harmony Forbearance

(GHF) Index to measure the motivation for forbearance due to group harmony. To accomplish these, I 1) employed an independent sample *t*-Test to compare means on GHF Index of the U.S sample and international sample; 2) constructed a matched sample of American students drawn from Study 2 and matched by score on the Forbearance Scale-5. I then employed an independent sample *t*-Test to compare means of the matched samples on GHF to examine whether their motives to promote group harmony differed.

English and Johns (2012) found that Chinese participants scored higher than American ones in habitual use of suppression. The tendency to maintain social harmony and forbear emotional expression for the sake of group harmony during conflict or problems occurred not only among Chinese, but also among Japanese (Fukuhara, 1989) and other Asian students (Yeh & Inose, 2002). Therefore, I expected that scores on GHF Index would be higher for international sample than those for predominantly U.S sample in Study 2 (Hypothesis 1).

Method

Participants. A different sample of international students and adults ($N = 39$; 24 men; 14 women; 1 did not report) was recruited through 1) undergraduate courses at the same university as in Study 1 and 2; they received a small amount of course credit for participating in the study; 2) emailing to adults who I know were raised in China and now live in the U.S. I combined these participants from two sources into one international sample because their scores did not differ significantly on Forbearance Scale-5 ($\chi^2 = 29.12$, ns) and GHFI-4 ($\chi^2 = .11$, ns). The sample was diverse in terms of age (46.2% 18-24 years old; 10.3% 25-34 years old; 28.2% 35-44 years old; 12.8% 45-54 years old; 2.6% over 55 years old), race/ethnicity (5.1% White; 20.5% African-American/Black; 66.7% Asian/Pacific Islander; 5.1% Latino/a; 2.6% Other) and religious affiliation (34.2% Baptist; 5.3% Presbyterian; 10.5% Catholic; 10.5% Muslim; 5.3% Buddhist;

2.6% Hindu; 15.8% None; and 15.8% Other). Participants came from various countries in Asia, Africa, Middle East and South America. Specifically, they came from: China (21), Ghana (2), Philippines (2), Vietnam (1), Sudan (1), Korea (1), Zambia (1), Kenya (1), Afghanistan (1), Ethiopia (1), Bolivia (1), Uganda (1), Pakistan (1), Jordan (1), India (1), Iran (1), and Mexico (1).

Creation of the matched sample for comparison purposes. I constructed a comparison (matched) sample of USA university students, explicitly excluding any foreign students, by drawing from Study 2. I matched each of the 39 students in the present study with one student in Study 2 on the basis of score on Forbearance Scale-5. If several students in Study 2 had the same score, I always selected the first one based on the random subject order. The characteristics of the comparison sample are as follows. The sample ($N = 37$; 15 men and 22 women) was diverse in terms of (race/ethnicity (45.9% White; 21.6% African-American/Black; 18.9% Asian/Pacific Islander; 5.4% Latino/a; 8.1% Other) and religious affiliation (16.2% Baptist; 2.7% Presbyterian; 18.9% Catholic; 5.4% Buddhist; 8.1% Hindu; 24.3% None; and 24.3% Other).

Measure. Participants completed the Forbearance Scale-72 reported in Study 1. I combined four items in the Forbearance Scale-72 to create the Group-Harmony Forbearance Index, which has high face validity to measure group harmony as the motivation for forbearance. Initial evidence of its construct validity was found in Study 2B, in which strong positive correlations existed between the GHFI and Forbearance Scale-5 for US university students. Self- Construal Scale-Interdependence Subscale (SCS; Singelis, 1994) was also included. Initial evidence of its construct validity was found in Study 2B, in which moderate positive correlations existed between SCS-Interdependence Subscale and Forbearance Scale-5 for U.S university students.

Procedure. After giving consent, participants completed demographic measures online. Then they rated the revised Forbearance Scale-72 items based on how they usually deal with offenses. (Again, only the Forbearance Scale-5 and GHF Index-4 were used in analyses.)

Results

The covariance matrix was analyzed with MLR estimation using *Mplus* 6.11 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) was used for missing data. To determine overall model fit, I examined several fit indices: χ^2 , the comparative fit index (CFI), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). As a rule of thumb, a CFI of approximately .95, an SRMR equal to or less than .08, and an RMSEA equal to or less than .06 suggest good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Also as a rule of thumb, a CFI of approximately .90, an SRMR equal to or less than .10, and an RMSEA equal to or less than .08 suggest adequate fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

I found that the one-factor model for both Forbearance Scale-5 and GHF Index-4 showed good fit in some indexes, For Forbearance Scale-5: $\chi^2(5, N=39) = 9.28, p = .10, CFI = .86$, and $SRMR = .06$. For GHF Index-4: $\chi^2(2, N=39) = 4.12, p = .13, CFI = 0$, and $SRMR = .05$. However, *RMSEA* for both of them were larger than the criteria. *RMSEA* in Forbearance Scale-5 = .15 (95% confidence interval [CI] = 0, .30); *RMSEA* in GHF Index-4 = .17 (95% confidence interval [CI] = 0, .39). Generally, the results of the sample provided additional support for the one-factor structure of the Forbearance Scale-5 and GHF Index-4, however, the CFI for GHF Index and the RMSEAs are troublesome in the international sample.

Results related to the mean comparison between the predominantly U.S sample and the international sample. Mean score on Forbearance Scale-5 did not show a significant difference between these two samples, $t(445) = -1.76, p = .08$. I proceeded to check the hypothesis.

As expected, the mean score on the GHF Index was higher for the international sample than for the predominantly U.S sample in Study 2, $t(434) = -2.84, p < .001$. In another related post hoc comparison, the mean score on SCS-Interdependence did not show a significant difference between the international sample and the U.S sample, $t(432) = -1.17, p = .24$.

Results related to the mean comparison between matched samples. Compared with the matched U.S sample, based on the same Forbearance Scale-5 scores, GHF Index scores for the international sample did not show significant difference, $t(73) = -1.59, p = .12$; SCS-interdependence subscale scores for the international sample did not show significant difference, $t(72) = -.32, p = .75$.

Discussion

In the current study, perhaps due to a small international sample size, there was no significant difference in scores on Forbearance Scale-5 and Self-Constructual-Interdependence between predominantly U.S sample and international sample, which did not support previous literatures about the related constructs such as emotion suppression (Butler et al., 2007; English & John, 2012; Matsumoto et al., 2008). However, it showed a significant difference in scores on GHF Index between these two samples, which might underscore the importance of investigating the motives of forbearance.

General Discussion

Normative data for two University USA samples ($N=921$) and one sample of international adults ($N=39$) was presented in Table 4.

In the studies, I developed the Forbearance Scale-5 and used factor analysis to determine, refine, and replicate the factor structure. Results supported the one-factor structure in Study 1, and this model replicated well in college (Study 2A) and international community (Study 3)

samples. Furthermore, in Study 2B, I provided initial evidence of construct validity for Forbearance Scale scores. As expected, the Forbearance Scale-5 showed a moderately strong positive correlation with Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ, Gross & John, 2003) and Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure-Forbearance Subscale (CCSM, Moore and Constantine, 2005), but these correlations were not so strong as to suggest that they were measuring identical constructs. As discussed previously, one subscale of ERQ is emotional suppression, which focuses on suppression of emotion as inner experience while forbearance is defined in my studies as suppression of emotional expression as visible behaviors. However, forbearance seemed to be sharing two components of emotion regulation: cognitive reappraisal and emotional suppression (Gross & John, 2003). Though further evidence is needed, Forbearance Scale-5 items such as “When I’m angry, I do not show it”, “I won’t express my negative emotions” hinted a subtle process of expressive suppression after a quick perhaps automatic cognitive evaluation.

Forbearance Scale-5 showed a moderately strong negative correlation with Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire-Negative Expressivity Subscale (BEQ), demonstrating good discriminant validity. As predicted, the Self-Construal Scale-Interdependence Subscale correlated moderately strongly with both Forbearance Scale-5 and Group-Harmony Forbearance

Table 4.

Normative Data for Two University USA Samples (N=921) and One Sample of International Adults (N=39)

Normative Data									
	Study 1: USA University Students (N=468)			Study 2: USA University Students (N=453)			Study 3: International Adults (N=39)		
	n	Forbearance Scale-5	GHF Index- 4	n	Forbearance Scale-5	GHF Index- 4	n	Forbearance Scale-5	GHF Index- 4
Norms for Each Sample									
University Students (for Studies 1 & 2)	468	15.48 (3.87)	12.40 (2.64)	453	15.64 (3.84)	12.89 (2.53)	-	-	-
International Adults (for Study 3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	39	16.81 (4.32)	14.11 (2.37)
Norms for Participants of Different Ages									
18-24 years old	422	15.57 (3.91)	12.46 (2.62)	422	15.77 (3.91)	12.91 (2.50)	18	18.00 (4.44)	14.31 (2.70)
25-34 years old	24	13.95 (3.73)	11.52 (2.94)	18	13.78 (3.21)	12.22 (2.71)	4	16.75 (3.20)	13.50 (3.32)
35-44 years old	4	17 (2.65)	14.33 (2.08)	4	15.00 (2.58)	13.50 (3.11)	11	14.80 (5.27)	14.00 (2.21)
45-54 years old	1	-	-	1	-	-	5	16.50 (2.38)	14.50 (2.08)
over 55 years old	0	-	-	0	-	-	1	-	-
Norms for Participants of Different Ethnicities or Races									

Table 4 continues

Table 4 continued

African American	88	15.78 (3.60)	12.66 (2.54)	98	16.13 (3.61)	13.06 (2.43)	8	16.43 (5.32)	14.29 (1.60)
Asian American	89	16.64 (3.24)	12.56 (2.33)	92	16.40 (3.45)	13.14 (2.54)	26	15.91 (3.96)	13.87 (2.56)
Caucasian	193	14.96 (3.88)	12.21 (2.68)	183	14.98 (4.10)	12.71 (2.55)	2	23.50 (.71)	18.00 (2.83)
Latino/a	35	14.48 (4.88)	12.12 (2.96)	36	15.49 (3.42)	12.66 (2.82)	2	19.50 (.71)	-
Native American	3	10.00 (4.36)	9.00 (4.36)	1	-	-	0	-	-
Other (or did not report)	44	16.08 (4.22)	13.08 (2.69)	32	16.61 (4.33)	13.26 (2.41)	1	-	-
Norms for Participants of Different Religions									
Baptist	88	15.82 (3.63)	12.62 (2.55)	86	16.26 (3.87)	13.43 (2.43)	13	16.58 (4.34)	14.83 (1.75)
Buddhist	20	14.94 (4.04)	11.78 (3.15)	17	16.13 (3.10)	12.94 (1.61)	2	12.50 (3.54)	-
Hindu	19	17.58 (2.12)	12.84 (1.83)	18	16.08 (4.56)	13.75 (2.70)	1	-	-
Muslim	21	17.32 (5.27)	13.26 (3.11)	23	16.00 (3.54)	13.00 (2.13)	4	20.75 (3.30)	16.50 (2.52)
Presbyterian	18	15.29 (3.37)	12.71 (2.26)	23	15.50 (2.82)	12.00(2.51)	2	11.50 (4.95)	11.50 (.71)
Roman Catholic	77	15.59 (4.05)	12.59 (2.91)	63	15.50 (3.59)	12.79 (2.63)	4	21.33 (3.21)	14.00 (1.73)
None	93	14.66 (3.82)	11.98 (2.82)	90	14.94 (4.05)	12.54 (2.73)	6	17.33 (3.20)	14.17 (3.06)
Other	116	15.29 (3.95)	12.36 (2.35)	125	15.71 (4.19)	12.91 (2.55)	6	16.20 (3.56)	13.80 (2.17)

Note. The Forbearance Scale-5 is a five-item version of the scale that measures forbearance, which is defined as *the attempt to suppress the visible signs of negative emotion (i.e., emotional expression) and visible behaviors (i.e., the expression of negative vengeful or avoidant motives) in response to a hurt or offense, often (but not always) for the sake of group harmony*. The GHF is a four-item index measuring the motives of forbearance-group harmony.

Index (GHF), which supported previous theorizing and literature. For example, Matsumoto et al. (2008) found that emotion suppression had a positive correlation with many collectivistic values, including embeddedness that encourages conformity and discourages individuals from dissenting and standing out (similar to group harmony). Thus, the general pattern of findings offered initial evidence for both convergent and discriminant validity.

Though there was no significant difference in scores on Forbearance Scale-5 between a predominantly U.S sample and an international sample perhaps due to small size of the latter sample, there was a significant difference in scores on GHF Index between these two samples, which supported previous literature about the related construct. For example, English and John (2012) found that Chinese participants scored higher than American ones in habitual use of suppression. Butler et al. (2007) found that participants with primary European values scored lower in habitual suppression than their counterparts with bicultural European-Asian values. In a study that expanded to 23 countries on 5 continents, Matsumoto et al. (2008) found that participants with cultures that value maintenance of social order scored higher on suppression while participants with cultures that value individual freedom and achievement scored lower on suppression.

Gross and his group found that within the U.S sample, emotional suppression was associated with negative psychological and social consequences (Gottman & Levenson, 1988; Gross, 2002; Gross & John, 2003; Gross & Levenson, 1993; John & Gross, 2004; Levenson & Gottman, 1985). Later, culture was found to be a moderator between suppression of emotion or emotional expression and psychological or social consequences when comparing U.S sample and international sample (Butler et al., 2007; Soto et al., 2011; Wei et al., 2012). However, not much research made it clear about which cultural components contributed to the difference. Moore &

Constantine (2005) noted that the collectivistic cultural system might encourage harmony control and forbearance (defined as *the tendency to minimize or conceal problems or concerns so as not to trouble or burden other*, p. 331) as their effective coping styles for international students. In the present studies, group harmony also appeared to be one of the factors in forbearance that leads to positive outcomes. For both the predominant U.S sample and international sample, Forbearance Scale-5 showed a strong positive relationship with Group Harmony Forbearance Index, which meant that it is more likely for people to forbear an offense for the sake of group harmony. In addition, mean score on GHF Index was higher for the international sample than it was for predominant U.S sample while the mean score on the Forbearance Scale-5 did not show significant difference between the two samples. Therefore, it seemed that people in these two samples did not differ on suppression of their emotional expression, but differed on the motives of suppression—group harmony. Therefore, it was suggested that a good measure of forbearance may require both high scores on the Forbearance Scale-5 and GHF Index to catch the essence of the defined forbearance in the current studies.

Limitations

The current studies had several limitations. First, the undergraduate samples were generally diverse in terms of gender and race/ethnicity, but were less diverse in terms of age, educational status and Self-Construal in Independence. The collected international community samples were diverse in terms of age, gender, educational status, and specific cultural background. However, the sample sizes were small compared with the U.S sample. Thus, given the importance of forbearance in collectivistic culture, the next step is to establish norms on larger international samples. Second, the current studies mostly employed cross-sectional, correlational designs due to the nature of measurement research. In the future, researchers might

examine whether and how forbearance might change in situations. Third, the current studies all used self-report measures. An interesting future study could be rating the forbearance of participants from the perspective of an “offender” in the lab.

Implications for Research and Theory

The present findings have important implications for our understanding about another way (mostly adaptive) to deal with transgressions. First, the results supported that in both individualistic and collectivistic culture, people may cope with transgressions with forbearance when they do not show explicitly their negative reactions/behaviors to offense, though they may feel different inside. Second, the results also highlighted the importance of goals for forbearance—protecting interpersonal relationships and harmony. Though it was not the focus of the current studies to explore specific goals under the umbrella of group harmony (e.g. forbearance helps promote group harmony and thus may reduce the chances of another transgression), group harmony was one of the goals that motivated individuals to pursue forbearance either consciously or unconsciously after transgressions (especially in some collectivistic cultures). Third, several studies have supported that emotion regulation (e.g. cognitive reappraisal) is of crucial importance for psychological health (e.g., Garnefski et al., 2001; Gross & Muñoz, 1995; Moore et al., 2008). Though the psychological outcomes associated with forbearance were not investigated in the current studies, the potential benefits of forbearance may include benefits of cognitive reappraisal if people pursue forbearance consciously in intrapersonal relationships and benefits of group harmony in interpersonal relationships. Fourth, in most studies that examined the cross-cultural difference when dealing with transgressions, emotion suppression has been the primary concept to be employed. Through the current studies, the forbearance scale was established and tested with initial supporting

evidence, which could be used for cross-cultural research in the future collaborating with other validated measures.

Implications for Practice

In clinical practice settings, such as university counseling centers where more international students started using services, the Forbearance Scale-5 and GHF Index-4 could provide therapists valuable information about how some students cope with stress and transgressions through forbearance. Furthermore, therapists need to be cautious about offering different suggestions to these students when forbearance may be positive for their psychological functioning. The same caution could also be applied to any interaction (e.g. in the admission office, international student office, etc) with international students who came from collectivistic culture.

This research provided new perspective to the field of business. For example, managers and executives should rethink the way they engage their business partners and evaluate performance of their employees when some of them may possess a significantly different view of forbearance. Indeed, this research is even more relevant now as international business relationship between countries widen and deepen in an unprecedented scale. For example, without prior knowledge about the difference in forbearance and its motives, Chinese people who typically have high forbearance scores may feel their American counterpart brash and agitated. American businessmen who usually have lower forbearance scores may feel their Chinese partners unpredictable and wooden, without paying attention to subtle signals of discomfort from their Chinese peers which is more likely to damage the relationship. Only

through proper trainings can each side adjust their behaviors and handle the difference in forbearance.

List of References

List of References

- Alvarez, A. N., & Juang, L. P. (2010). Filipino Americans and racism: A multiple meditation model of coping. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*(2), 167-178.
- Bushman, B. J., Baumeister, R. F., & Phillips, C. M. (2001). Do people agree to improve their mood? Catharsis beliefs, affect regulation opportunity, and aggressive responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 17-32.
- Butler, E. A., Egloff, B., Wilhelm, F. H., Smith, N. C., Erickson, E. A., & Gross, J. J. (2003). The social consequences of expressive suppression. *Emotion, 3*(1), 48-67.
- Butler, E. A., & Gross, J. J. (2004). Hiding feeling in social contexts: Out of sight is not out of mind. In P. Philippot & R. Feldman (Eds.) *The regulation of emotion* (pp. 101-126). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Butler, E. A., Lee, T. L., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Emotion regulation and culture: Are the social consequences of emotion suppression culture-specific? *Emotion, 7*(1), 30-48.
- Campos, J. J., Walle, E. A., Dahl, A., & Main, A. (2011). Reconceptualizing emotion regulation. *Emotion Review, 3*, 26-35.
- Chiang, W. (2012). The suppression of emotional expression in interpersonal context. *Bulletin of Educational Psychology, 43*(3), 657-680.
- English, T., & John, O. P. (2012). Understanding the social effects of emotion regulation: The mediating role of authenticity for individual differences in suppression. *Emotion*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0029847
- Friesen, W. V. (1972). *Cultural differences in facial expressions in a social situation: An experimental test of the concept of display rules*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Francisco.
- Fugita, S., Ito, K., Abe, J., & Takeuchi, D. (1991). Japanese American. In N. Mokuaua (Ed.), *Handbook of social services for Asian and Pacific Islanders* (pp. 61-77). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Fukuhara, M. (1989). Counseling psychology in Japan. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 38*, 409-422.
- Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1988). The social psychophysiology of marriage. In P. Noller & M. A. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *Perspectives on marital interaction* (pp. 182-200).

Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Gross, J. J., & Levenson, R. W. (1993). Emotional suppression: Physiology, self-report, and expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(6), 970-986.
- Gross, J. J. (1998b). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 271-299.
- Gross, J. J. (2002). Emotion regulation: Affective, cognitive, and social consequences. *Psychophysiology*, 39, 281-291.
- Gross, J.J., & John, O.P. (1997). Revealing feelings: Facets of emotional expressivity in self-reports, peer ratings, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 435-448.
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 348-362.
- Gross, J. J., John, O. P., & Richards, J. M. (2000). The dissociation of emotion expression from emotion experience: A personality perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 712-726. Retrieved August 17, 2012, from <http://psp.sagepub.com/content/26/6/712>
- Haga, S. M., Kraft, P., Corby, E.-K. (2009). Emotion regulation: Antecedents and well-being outcomes of cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression in cross-cultural samples. *J Happiness Stud*, 10, 271-291. doi: 10.1007/s10902-007-9080-3
- Hofstede, G. H. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hu, J., & Huang, X. (2006). A research on self-modesty in Chinese society. *China Academic Journal*, 29(6), 1392-1395.
- Jeronimus, B.F., Riese, H., Sanderman, R., & Ormel, J. (2014). Mutual reinforcement between neuroticism and life Experiences: A five-wave, 16-year study to test reciprocal causation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107 (4): 751-64.
- Joffe, H., & Staerkle, C. (2007). The centrality of the self-control ethos in western aspersions regarding outgroups: A social representational approach to stereotype content. *Culture & Psychology*, 13 (4), 395-418
- John, O. P., & Gross, J. J. (2004). Healthy and unhealthy emotion regulation: Personality processes, individual differences, and life span development. *Journal of Personality*, 72, 1301-1333.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and

- theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social functions of emotions at multiple levels of analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13, 505–522.
- Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1985). Physiological and affective predictors of change in relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 85–94.
- Matsumoto, D. (2007a). Culture, context, and behavior. *Journal of Personality*, 75, 1285–1320.
- Matsumoto, D., Nakagawa, S., & Yoo, S. H. (2008). Culture, emotion regulation, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(6), 925–937.
- McCullough, M. E., Fincham, F. D., & Tsang, J. (2003). Forgiveness, forbearance and time: The temporal unfolding of transgression-related interpersonal motivations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(3), 540–557.
- Mesquita, B. & Albert, D. (2006). The cultural regulation of emotions. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Moore, III, J. L., & Constantine, M. G. (2005). Development and initial validation of the collectivistic coping styles measure with African, Asian, and Latin American international students. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 27(4), 329–347.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Rothmann, S & Coetzer, E. P. (2003). The big five personality dimensions and job performance. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29. doi:10.4102/sajip.v29i1.88. Retrieved 27 June 2013.
- Rottenberg, J., & Gross, J. J. (2007). Emotion and emotion regulation: A map for psychotherapy researchers. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 14(4), 323–328.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2004). Mapping and interpreting cultural differences around the world. In H. Vinken, J. Soeters, & P. Ester (Eds.), *Comparing cultures, dimensions of culture in a comparative perspective* (pp. 43–73). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents, and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C. Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, & G. Eva (Eds.), *Measuring attitudes cross-nationally: Lessons from the European social survey* (pp. 161–193). London, England: Sage.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580–591.
- Soto, J. A., Perez, C. R., Kim, Y.-H., Lee, E. A., Minnick, M. R. (2011). Is expressive suppression always associated with poorer psychological functioning? A cross-cultural comparison between European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese. *Emotion*, 11, 1450–1455.

- Tashima, E., & Ito, K. (1982). *Asia-Americam self-concept: Preliminary thoughts on illness express and the role of women*. Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
- Tavris, C. (1989). *Anger: The misunderstood emotion*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323–338.
- Wang, M.-J., Dai, J.-J. (2011). Chinese forbearance ethos disclosing selfing and othering in stereotyping modeling. *Culture & Psychology*, 17, 398-417. doi: 10.1177/1354067X11408132
- Wang, L., Shi, Z., & Li, H. (2009). Neuroticism, extraversion, emotion regulation, negative affect and positive affect: The mediating roles of reappraisal and suppression. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(2), 193-194.
- Wei, M., Liao, K. Y., Chao, R. C., Heppner, P. P., & Ku, T. (2012). Forbearance coping, identification with heritage culture, acculturative stress, and psychological among Chinese international students . *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(1), 97-106.
- Yeh, C. J., & Inose, M. (2002). Difficulties and coping strategies of Chinese, Japanese and Korean immigrant students. *Adolescence*, 37, 69-82.
- Yeh, C. J., Arora, A. K., & Wu, K. (2005). A new theoretical model of collectivistic coping. In P. T. P. Wong & C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping*. New York: Springer.
- Yeh, C. J., & Kwong, A. (2008). Asian American indigenous healing and coping. *Asian American Psychology: Current Perspectives* (pp. 559-574). New York: Hoboken : Taylor and Francis.
- Yue, X. (2001). Culturally constructed coping among university students in Beijing. *Journal of Psychology in Chinese Societies*, 2(1), 119-137

Appendix A

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire

1. Your Gender (drop-down choices)

2. Your Age

3. What is your current marital status? (choose one) Single Married Separated Divorced Widowed

4. What is your Ethnicity/Race? (drop-down choices)

5. What US state were you raised in? (Note. If you moved around growing up, please select the state that you most identify with in terms of where you are from.)_ [drop down menu of US States, Other, or not from the US]

6. What is your religious affiliation? (drop-down choices, Baptist, Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, None . . .)

7. How many (if any) activities or services do you attend at your religious institution (choose one)?

None One a year A few times a year One a month One a week More than one a week

8. How committed are you to your religion (choose one)?

Not at all Very Little Moderately Very Much Totally

9. How intense is your spiritual life (choose one)?

Not at all Very Little Moderately Very Much Totally

Self-Construal Scale (SCS)

DIRECTIONS: This scale consists of a number of statements that describe different feelings or behaviors. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1=strongly disagree

2=moderately disagree

3=somewhat disagree

4=neutral

5=somewhat agree

6=moderately agree

7=strongly agree

1. ____ I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
2. ____ It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
3. ____ My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
4. ____ I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor (or my boss).
5. ____ I respect people who are modest about themselves.
6. ____ I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
7. ____ My relationships . . . are more important than my own accomplishments.
8. ____ I should [consider] my parents' advice when making education/career plans.
9. ____ It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
10. ____ I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group.
11. ____ If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
12. ____ Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
13. ____ I'd rather say "no" directly than risk being misunderstood.

14. ____ Speaking up during a class (or a meeting) is not a problem for me.
15. ____ Having a lively imagination is important to me.
16. ____ I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
17. ____ I act the same way at home that I do at school.
18. ____ Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
19. ____ I act the same way no matter who I am with.
20. ____ I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them.
21. ____ I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.
22. ____ I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
23. ____ My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
24. ____ I value being in good health above everything.

Collectivistic Coping Styles Measure (Forbearance subscale)

The statements below are intended to represent some of the behaviors you might use to cope with stressful situations in your life. Please use the following 5-point scale to indicate the extent to which you used the following strategies to help you cope with the stress you experienced.

1	2	3	4	5
Not used	used a little	unsure	used moderately	used often

1. I told myself that I could overcome the problem or concern.
2. I did not express my feelings about the problem to others because I did not want to burden them.
3. I minimized the problem or concern so others wouldn't worry about me.
4. I kept the problems or concerns to myself in order not to worry others.

Big Five

1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree

Is talkative	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to find fault with others	1	2	3	4	5
Does a thorough job	1	2	3	4	5
Is depressed, blue	1	2	3	4	5
Is original, comes up with new ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Is reserved	1	2	3	4	5
Is helpful and unselfish with others	1	2	3	4	5
Can be somewhat careless	1	2	3	4	5
Is relaxed, handles stress well	1	2	3	4	5
Is curious about many different things	1	2	3	4	5
Is full of energy	1	2	3	4	5
Starts quarrels with others	1	2	3	4	5
Is a reliable worker	1	2	3	4	5
Can be tense	1	2	3	4	5
Is ingenious, a deep thinker	1	2	3	4	5
Generates a lot of enthusiasm	1	2	3	4	5
Has a forgiving nature	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to be disorganized	1	2	3	4	5
Worries a lot	1	2	3	4	5
Has an active imagination	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to be quiet	1	2	3	4	5
Is generally trusting	1	2	3	4	5
Tends to be lazy	1	2	3	4	5
Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	1	2	3	4	5
Is inventive	1	2	3	4	5

Has an assertive personality	1	2	3	4	5
Can be cold and aloof	1	2	3	4	5
Perseveres until the task is finished	1	2	3	4	5
Can be moody	1	2	3	4	5
Values artistic, aesthetic experiences	1	2	3	4	5
Is sometimes shy, inhibited	1	2	3	4	5
Is considerate and kind to almost everyone	1	2	3	4	5
Does things efficiently	1	2	3	4	5
Remains calm in tense situations	1	2	3	4	5
Prefers work that is routine	1	2	3	4	5
Is outgoing, sociable	1	2	3	4	5
Is sometimes rude to others	1	2	3	4	5
Makes plans and follow through with them	1	2	3	4	5
Gets nervous easily	1	2	3	4	5
Likes to reflect, play with ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Has few artistic interests	1	2	3	4	5
Likes to cooperate with others	1	2	3	4	5
Is easily distracted	1	2	3	4	5
Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature	1	2	3	4	5

Emotional Regulation Questionnaire (ERQ)

Instructions and Items

We would like to ask you some questions about your emotional life, in particular, how you control (that is, regulate and manage) your emotions. The questions below involve two distinct aspects of your emotional life. One is your emotional experience, or what you feel like inside. The other is your emotional expression, or how you show your emotions in the way you talk, gesture, or behave. Although some of the following questions may seem similar to one another, they differ in important ways. For each item, please answer using the following scale:

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
strongly neutral strongly
disagree agree

1. ____ When I want to feel more *positive* emotion (such as joy or amusement), I *change what I'm thinking about*.
2. ____ I keep my emotions to myself.
3. ____ When I want to feel less *negative* emotion (such as sadness or anger), I *change what I'm thinking about*.
4. ____ When I am feeling *positive* emotions, I am careful not to express them.
5. ____ When I'm faced with a stressful situation, I make myself *think about it* in a way that helps me stay calm.
6. ____ I control my emotions by *not expressing them*.
7. ____ When I want to feel more *positive* emotion, I *change the way I'm thinking about the situation*.
8. ____ I control my emotions by *changing the way I think about the situation* I'm in.
9. ____ When I am feeling *negative* emotions, I make sure not to express them.
10. ____ When I want to feel less *negative* emotion, I *change the way I'm thinking about the situation*.

Berkeley Expressivity Questionnaire (BEQ)-Negative Expressivity Subscale

For each statement below, please indicate your agreement or disagreement. Do so by filling in the blank in front of each item with the appropriate number from the following rating scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly			neutral			strongly
disagree						agree

- ____ 1. People often do not know what I am feeling.
- ____ 2. It is difficult for me to hide my fear.
- ____ 3. I've learned it is better to suppress my anger than to show it.
- ____ 4. No matter how nervous or upset I am, I tend to keep a calm exterior.
- ____ 5. Whenever I feel negative emotions, people can easily see exactly what I am feeling.
- ____ 6. What I'm feeling is written all over my face.

Vita

Yin Lin was born on October 16, 1984, in China, and is a Chinese citizen. She graduated from No. 2 High School, Yantai, China in 2003. She received her Bachelor of Law from Nanjing University, Nanjing, China in 2007. Then she came to the U.S and received a Master of Arts in Counseling in Higher Education from University of Delaware in 2010. On May, 2013, she received a Master of Science in Counseling Psychology from Virginia Commonwealth University.